DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 540 CE 075 287

TITLE An Interdisciplinary Core Curriculum for the Adult Learner. Final Report.

INSTITUTION New School for Social Research, New York, NY.

SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 1996-00-00

NOTE 163p.; Brochures, videotape, and sample course packet are not included in this document and not available from EDRS.

CONTRACT P-116-A-20259

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Students; Bachelors Degrees; Comparative Analysis; Computer Uses in Education; Conventional Instruction; Cooperative Planning; *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Distance Education; Higher Education; *Humanities; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Partnerships in Education; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

This set of reports contains materials related to a 3-year project to develop, implement, assess, and disseminate three interdisciplinary courses in the humanities and social sciences that were designed especially for adult baccalaureate students at the New School for Social Research. Included in the first report are a project summary, executive summary, and final report of the project, which entailed the following activities: development of the three courses; pilot testing of the courses in both classroom and distance learning environments; identification of the differences inherent to each delivery method; and identification of a distance learning environment through which an increasing portion of the New School's baccalaureate curriculum could be offered. The second report, which is the University of Michigan's evaluation of the project, contains the following: project overview; summary of the evaluation; summaries of the results of the student and faculty surveys administered at the project's beginning and end; and discussions of student recruitment and services, faculty development, curricular issues, and technological issues. Appendixes constituting approximately two-thirds of the second report contain the beginning-of-term and course evaluation questionnaires and detailed summaries of the results of each questionnaire. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

The New School

New School for Social Research Distance Learning

68 Fifth Avenue New York NY 10011 212.229.5880 facsimile 212.989.2928

ED 413 540

An Interdisciplinary Core Curriculum for the Adult Learner

Final Report
Cover Sheet

Grantee Organization:

New School for Social Research
66 West 12th Street
New York, NY 10011

Grant Number:

P-116-A-20259

Project Dates:

Starting Date: October 1, 1992
Ending Date: September 30, 1995 (extended to November 30, 1996)
No. Months: **36** (38 with extension)

Project Director:

Elizabeth Dickey, Dean
The New School
66 West 12th Street
New York, NY 10011
Telephone: (212) 229-5615

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FIPSE Program Officer:

Jay Donahue

Grant Award:

Year 1:$ 98,747
Year 2:$ 102,212
Year 3:$ 97,410
Total: $ 298,369

Academic Divisions
of the New School
for Social Research

Graduate Faculty
Graduate School
Eugene Lang College
Mannes
The New School
Parsons

CE075287

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Project Summary

The New School for Social Research, in collaboration with the University of Michigan, undertook a three-year project to develop, implement, assess and disseminate three interdisciplinary course courses in the humanities and social sciences designed especially for adult baccalaureate students. The pilot courses were offered in both classroom and distance learning environments, utilizing computer, multimedia and telecommunications technologies. Our objective was to learn from the differences inherent to each delivery method. This experience would allow The New School to define a distance learning environment through which an increasing portion of The New School's BA curriculum will be offered. Today, three years later, The New School's DIAL program (Distance Instruction for Adult Learners) offers dozens of courses each semester to a growing population of students pursuing BA degrees at The New School or elsewhere, or simply engaging in the process in the not-for-credit pursuit of intellectual enrichment.

Elizabeth Dickey, Dean, The New School
FIPSE Project Director
66 West 12th Street
New York, NY 10011
(212) 229-5613/telephone
(212) 645-0661/facsimile
edickey@dialnsa.edu/email

Project Reports and Products:

The New School Distance Learning Conference, November 10-11, 1995. Project methodology, outcomes and recommendations for future work were presented to over 200 college and university administrators. Proceedings will be available on a world-wide web site later this spring.

Statistical Analysis of Pilot Course Evaluations. This in-depth compilation of evaluation methodologies and results was produced by our assessment partners from the University of Michigan and is appended to this document.

2. Executive Summary

An Interdisciplinary Core Curriculum for the Adult Learner

New School for Social Research, 66 West 12th Street, New York, NY 10011
Elizabeth Dickey, Project Director; (212) 229-5613

Project Overview. The New School for Social Research, in collaboration with the University of Michigan, undertook a three-year project to develop, implement, assess and disseminate three interdisciplinary course courses in the humanities and social sciences designed especially for adult baccalaureate students. The pilot courses were offered in both classroom and distance learning environments, utilizing computer, multimedia and telecommunications technologies. Our objective was to learn from the differences inherent to each delivery method. This experience would allow The New School to define a distance learning environment through which an increasing portion of The New School's BA curriculum will be offered. Our work led to the development of a curriculum development model based on faculty training and technology informed at every decision point by ongoing assessment — we constantly sample our teachers and students to find out what is working and what is not and we use this input to enhance the program. Today, The New School's DIAL program (Distance Instruction for Adult Learners) offers dozens of courses each semester to a growing population of students pursuing BA degrees at The New School or elsewhere, or simply engaging in the process in the not-for-credit pursuit of intellectual enrichment.

Purpose. The purpose of our project was to develop, implement, assess and disseminate a very cost-effective approach to providing general education courses for adult degree students. We began with the idea that the development of new courses specifically for the distance learning environment would be the most effective way of having a positive impact on the courses of study of adult degree students. Our experiences indicated that instead, we would be more effective applying the principles learned in the research phase (in terms of pedagogical approaches, group dynamics, teaching and learning styles, etc.) to the adaptation of existing curricula, so that we could offer both greater breadth and depth in the areas of study. This decision led to a modification of our purpose: we began to aim at the creation of a curriculum development program which would (a) train and enable New School instructors to adapt their classroom curricula to the new delivery system, (b) integrate ongoing assessment of student achievement and satisfaction into the curriculum development process, and (c) move toward the delivery of our complete BA program on-line as soon as practical.

Background and Origins. The New School for Social Research was founded in 1919 as a center for "discussion, instruction and counseling for mature men and women," and by the 1980s had grown into America's first university for adults. As a major urban university, the New School for Social Research draws upon and contributes to the rich resources of New York City; some

40,000 students annually attend classes at its seven divisions annually, enriching the University with a variety of cultures, perspectives and talents. Within this context, The New School has become a national leader in innovative approaches to adult education. An early pioneer in the distance delivery of academic programming (courses in the graduate program in Media Studies have been available on-line since 1985), The New School in 1991 was well-positioned to bring its experience and organizational knowledge to bear on the challenges of providing meaningful educational programming to adult students who want to complete their undergraduate study while challenged by the competing demands of work, family and myriad other pressures of modern life. The fact that these students could not continue to participate in traditional on-campus programs was reflected in declining enrollments at all institutions. The potential to increase access through the convenience of computer conferencing was the primary motivator to develop this project. In addition to our grant from FIPSE, significant capital contributions to the project were made by the University, and we received small planning grants from the AT&T and Sloan Foundations.

Project Description. The New School's FIPSE project was directed at creating a curriculum for delivery to distant students pursuing an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts and sciences. During year one, we created three new courses in the humanities and social sciences, using the most senior of our faculty. In the second year, these courses were offered first on campus (in a traditional classroom setting) and then on-line, through computer conferencing. We studied the differences in student and teacher satisfaction in each medium to assess the relative strengths and weakness of the distance environment. During the third and final year of the project, we transferred the new teaching skills through a three-week faculty development program to three new instructors, and offered the courses again on-line. Our findings concentrated around the needs to (a) provide in-depth faculty development for technologically-mediated education; (b) create a delivery system in which technology is as transparent as possible to the end user; and (c) offer on-line orientation for students new to the environment. These needs were addressed as a larger curriculum development effort was undertaken, and today over 700 students participate each year in dozens of courses. Close to 150 faculty members have been trained in the technology, pedagogical considerations, and issues of group dynamics, teaching and learning styles in a computer classroom. Over 200 courses have been adapted to or created for the environment. Our assessment program is fully integrated into the system, to assure a constant flow of information to formative and summative evaluation activities. We expect that, over time, more courses and additional degree programs will be made available through DIAL.

Evaluation/Project Results. Our assessment partners, from the School of Education at the University of Michigan, developed a number of instruments which we have used to collect data about various aspects of our project as it developed. Ongoing evaluation has become an integral part of our program for both assessment (summative) and developmental (formative) purposes. During the first phase of our project, as we were creating the courses which were to inform the shape and growth of the larger program, assessment of faculty comfort and satisfaction with the pedagogical tools and capabilities of the environment suggested that technology can be a barrier to educational communication if it intrudes on the process. This discovery led us to change the computer program we used for our system, and to develop a system which is as invisible and intuitive as possible. Feedback from students in pilot courses suggested that smaller class sizes than is traditional in the campus setting would enable closer and more effective communication. As a result, we now limit our on-line classes to fifteen students. In all instances, academic performance in on-line classes has been as good or better as in the same classes held in the traditional setting. We have discovered that this effect can be heightened by taking advantage of the increased intensity of the on-line experience to shorten the duration of distance classes — we currently offer in eight weeks on-line courses that last a full semester (12 weeks) on campus. Overall our experience has been a positive one and we intend to continue to grow the on-line program. We are fully committed to the continued development of our faculty development effort, and have initiated a new project to develop that into a model which can be exported to other institutions. Plans for the future include additional work on student orientation and a focus on development the learning styles and skills most effective in this environment.

Summary and Conclusions. The New School's history and experience in adult education, coupled with an unusual degree of flexibility in our planning and implementation processes, created an ideal environment in which to undertake this type of project. With the dedicated support of a great many people, inside and outside the organization, we were able to tackle the difficult administrative and operating issues which arose from the realization that committing to distance learning would cause us to fundamentally change our organization. The project led us to re-examine our policies and structures regarding everything from intellectual property ownership to whether or not students need measles shots to matriculate. Issues which must be considered by institutions undertaking a distance learning initiative include:

- the administrative positioning of the program (centralized or de-centralized?),
- the ability to support and withstand budgetary commitments which will far outstrip revenues for several years during start-up, and
- the degree to which faculty and administrators can exercise flexibility in the ways they do their jobs.

We are confident that asynchronous distance learning lives up to the promise of increased access, which was our primary point of inquiry. Long-term success, however, depends on students feeling that they are getting all the benefits of a "traditional" experience in the non-traditional environment.

Final Report

A. Project Overview

The original objective of our project was to develop, deliver, assess, and disseminate a series of three interdisciplinary core courses, in the humanities and social sciences, designed especially for adult baccalaureate students. Our methodology was to be as follows: during year one, teams of faculty would work on the design of the courses; in year two, the courses would be offered on campus in traditional classroom settings in the fall semester and on-line, using interactive computer technology, in the spring semester. During year three, we would generalize the experiences gained to share it with other institutions so that they might directly and immediately benefit from our project. We anticipated that about 700 students and 12 faculty would benefit directly from the project.

In operation, the project grew to form the basis of a major new initiative at The New School focused on developing a body of knowledge for all institutions seeking to address the changing needs of the adult baccalaureate student. Our challenge evolved into the need to find a method of delivery which emphasized convenience to students and faculty, which provided full access the wide range of university programs and services, and which was reachable from students' homes and offices. In short, we needed to find a method which increased accessibility while simultaneously overcoming boundaries to participation and extending the reach of our resources.

We met this challenge by designing a fully interactive computer conferencing program with the key features of asynchronisity and accessibility. Our system was designed from the beginning to allow participation at any time of the day or night, from any location at which a computer can be connected to a telephone line. Our program is called DIAL — Distance Instruction for Adult Learners.

The content of our DIAL program is the curriculum of The New School's: virtually all of the courses taught on DIAL are also taught, by many of the same teachers, in the classroom (frequently in the same semester). Occasionally, we have been able to use DIAL technology to bring a unique to course to the campus, such as last Spring when an eminent scholar of conceptual art led a symposium on the life and work of Joseph Beuys from her home in Ghent, Belgium.

Today, our program offers dozens of courses each semester from across The New School's curriculum. Over 150 instructors have been trained to teach and develop curriculum in the new environment, and over 200 courses are now available overall. Our BA program is fully available on-line, enabling students to matriculate and complete their degrees without ever visiting the campus. We anticipate that the end of the spring 1996 semester, we will have had well over 1,000 registration in DIAL courses.

B. Purpose

The project was designed to address two major changes in the higher education environment which have emerged since the 1970s. These are (a) the increasing age of baccalaureate students and (b) the need to reform the baccalaureate curriculum to assure that students are provided with the basic skills and knowledge needed by an educated citizenry.

Thus, the major purpose of our project was to develop, implement, assess and disseminate a very cost-effective approach to providing liberal arts courses for adult degree students. Recognizing that this approach had to be convenient to a student body of adults who were working, who had families and other commitments, we planned to utilize new interactive computer technologies as the delivery platform for our new curriculum. We began with the idea that the development of new courses would be the most effective way of having a positive impact on the courses of study of adult degree students. Our experiences indicated that instead, we would be more effective applying the principles learned in the research phase (in terms of pedagogical approaches, group dynamics, teaching and learning styles, etc.) to the adaptation of existing curricula, so that we could offer both greater breadth and depth in the areas of study. This decision led to a modification of our purpose: we began to aim at the creation of a curriculum development program which would (a) train and enable New School instructors to adapt their classroom curricula to the new delivery system, (b) integrate ongoing assessment of student achievement and satisfaction into the curriculum development process, and (c) move toward the delivery of our complete BA program as soon as possible.

C. Background and Origins

The New School was founded in 1919 to serve the intellectual, cultural, artistic and professional needs of adult students. It now serves that constituency through seven divisions: the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, the Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, the Parsons School of Design, Eugene Lang College, the Mannes College of Music, the School of Dramatic Arts, and founding division, known simply as The New School.

Today, the New School for Social Research is a complex urban university with graduate, undergraduate and professional degree programs in many fields, but the commitment to lifelong learning remains as central to our mission as at the time of our founding.

The typical New School student is in his or her mid- to late thirties, securely employed, involved in networks of responsibilities at home, at work and in the community. He or she is also part of a highly mobile group, traveling frequently for business or pleasure. As a result, all our distance services are designed specifically for the adult student who has a busy life but who wants to pursue an educational program and also is committed to lifelong learning. Every administrative office and academic department at The New School is designed with the needs and concerns of adult students in mind.

Over our 75-year history, The New School has developed an approach to learning that is clearly reflective of adult learning styles. Unlike traditional academic programs, which require certain courses in a certain order to create a coherent whole, at The New School teachers and students experience particular courses rather than patterns or courses; thus, coherence is supplied by the student rather than by institutional requirements. This is true for the student pursuing a baccalaureate as well as the non-credit lifelong learner.

Our faculty is as unique as our student body and program structure. Virtually all of our instructors are part-time. Subject-matter experts who support themselves through professional rather than academic work, our faculty teach because they enjoy interacting with students, and because they care passionately about their fields. Most instructors teach one or two classes each academic year.

Because the faculty is part-time and the curriculum very flexible, we were able to implement the changes needed to support our new program on a faster timetable than a more traditionally-structured institution might. The administration is small, energetic and used to challenges of program development. We are an entrepreneurial environment as well, which encouraged careful assessment of the business aspects of the project. Recognizing the increased demand for flexibility in program delivery and the need for the development of a new kind of interdisciplinary curriculum for adult students, this project was seen as an essential effort to adapt our traditional delivery system to the changing needs of our constituency.

In addition to our FIPSE grant, the University contributed significant funding to the start-up capitalization of the project; this supported the renovation of office space, the acquisition of computer and communications equipment and software, and the consulting services necessary to get the delivery technologies up and running. We also received small planning grants from the AT&T Foundation (to study faculty development needs) and the Sloan Foundation (for curriculum planning).

D. Project Description

Our FIPSE project began as planned, with the identification of three senior faculty members, each of whom served as the chair of one of our major academic departments, to develop three new interdisciplinary courses. These courses were *Identity: The Modular Construction of Personality*, *The Making of Americans*, and *Philosophical Dilemmas of a Technological Society*. The courses were offered on campus in the fall 1994 semester; the instructors reported very successful experiences, reflected in a level and depth of discourse equal to any encountered in the best of undergraduate courses. The students, after becoming accustomed to the rigorous demands of the courses, challenged themselves and each other; the products of their experiences — papers, reports, presentations — were uniformly of high quality.

In the spring 1995 semester, the same courses were taught by the same faculty members on-line. By the time the courses were fully underway, they were running smoothly and the instructors reported a high level of interaction, a new "closeness" to the subject matter enabled by the intensity of the on-line environment, and a more sophisticated level of involvement by the students. This type involvement was evidenced by students initiating lines of disucssion rather than simply responding to questions or probes by the instructor, and by the rapid development of collaborations between and among students — on their own initiatives — to work out complex problems or intellectual issues.

At this point the decision was taken to broaden the project, earlier than expected, to focus on the development of an entire curriculum on-line. At the same time, we introduced new computer conferencing software designed to support our commitment to low-end user technology while allowing us to provide a sophisticated learning environment. Based on feedback from students and faculty, and discussions among administrators at The New School and elsewhere, we outlined a five-point philosophy which would serve as the foundation of our program:

> (1) Education, not the spread of technology, is the mission of the University and the program;
> (2) Program dissemination should be developed at the lowest common denominator of receiver technology, so that the greatest number of students can be served, and the program has an obligation to provide the most sophisticated product possible within that framework;
> (3) Distant students should not be made to feel encumbered by their distance from the campus, and are thus entitled to the full range of University benefits and services available to on-campus students;
> (4) The learning experience provided through the distance format will be necessarily different but in no way less rich or rigorous than that provided on campus, and mutual expectations between faculty and students will be the same as they are in a classroom environment; and, finally,
> (5) Documentation of work in the New School distance learning program will not differ from documentation of work in any campus-based New School program, and participants in and graduates of distance programs are entitled to the same rights, privileges and immunities as participants in and graduates of any New School program.

We set out to build a rich on-line environment in which students would have access to their electronic classrooms, of course, but also to our bookstore, library, student support services, and social activities — all available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We also planned to provide 24-hour telephone tech support on a toll-free telephone number.

We decided to use multiple media (printed matter, audio and video tapes) to supplement the on-line interaction and thus integrate more richness into the environment without abandoning our commitment to low-end participant technology.

Our faculty and courses represent a wide range of disciplines from the social sciences and humanities, business and computer instruction, foreign languages and computer science. A major component of our DIAL program is a three-month on-line, asynchronous faculty development conference required of all instructors selected by their academic departments to teach through DIAL. Our faculty development program focuses on *hows:* how to use the technology, how to teach asynchronously, how to involve students, how to use the technology to bring in external resources. In addition, because the object of the development program is the creation of the instructor's on-line course, curriculum development is integrated into the program's operation. Once through the development program, a faculty member is able not only to teach well on-line but to continue to adapt or develop new courses for the environment on his or her own.

We have found that students' adaptation to this environment becomes more challenging as content moves closer to skill-based along a continuum on which knowledge is at the opposite end.

In DIAL's computer conferencing environment, participants log in regularly and read developments since last they connected and post responses. Students and faculty each log in three to five times each week; instructors provide lectures, offer resources, ask and answer questions, give assignments, assess progress, and give feedback while students discuss topics, post comments, questions, and observations. We have found that the most daunting aspect of the process is "jump starting" the dialogue. The benefits of asynchronisity also require some discipline; frequently, students are slow to join in the dialogue at the beginning of a semester. We require a minimum of three connections a week, and will telephone, write to and otherwise "nag" participants into joining the discussion . . . a process which, after a week or so, gets the interaction going.

The DIAL community consists of students from all over the US and from abroad, and faculty participants from varied locales as well. Today, about 70% of our students are New York based individuals who have studied at our Greenwich Village campus, but this percentage goes down each semester as we broaden our reach.

Faculty members are learning to use the benefits of asynchronous distance learning to bring in experts to enrich their classes, regardless of the location or schedules of these experts. We provide guest accounts and crash training for those visitors who might need it.

DIAL enrollments are 60% non-credit (what we call "price-insensitive course casuals" — people who take fairly expensive single courses for immediate personal or professional development). The remaining 40% is made up of credit students pursuing degrees at The New School or elsewhere. All students pay the same tuition and fees as their on-campus colleagues, and credit students may apply financial aid to their DIAL courses. (In a separate activity which overlapped the final year of our FIPSE grant, The New School undertook a major market analysis which led to a clearer understanding of several target "niches" for our adult-oriented curriculum. This study is informing many current decisions about how to attract more baccalaureate students to the DIAL environment, and we have seen a small improvement in the percentages already. We hope to achieve a balance of about 50-50 credit and non-credit by the time the program reached full maturity.)

One of the major benefits of distance learning is the ability to enrich an institution's offerings without increasing overhead — an important facility in this era of downsizing. The New School and the Rochester Institute of Technology have initiated a pilot collaboration to demonstrate this facility. We are making courses from each others' curricula available via asynchronous technology to students at the other school. This enables us to import from RIT courses in areas in we do not have curricular strength (science, technology, etc.) and export to them courses in our areas of strength (humanities, social sciences, etc.). This capability adds to the breadth and depth of curricular offerings, helping students at both institutions to select courses from a well-balanced selection each semester.

Because of the nature and newness of our program, it is hard to draw any conclusions yet about the impact of DIAL on degree completion. We know that as of last summer, 18 students who had to leave Manhattan for any number of reasons have been able to finish their coursework through DIAL — from different parts of the US, from Singapore and Paris. In addition, many on-campus students take one or two DIAL courses in conjunction with one or two on-campus courses; clearly this will lead to a faster completion rate over time (perhaps by as much as one or two semesters).

We have also found that students at other schools come to DIAL to take courses which are not available on their campuses at times or in semesters which fit the student's schedule; this clearly enables these individuals to stay on track, not losing time to scheduling conflicts.

In conclusion, we feel that the project has demonstrated the validity of our expectations completely: by enhancing access to our programs, adult students can take more courses and complete their programs faster, without sacrificing quality. This is beneficial in terms of student enthusiasm, program development, and overall enrollment management, and, most important, in terms of the students' own growth and development.

E. Evaluation and Project Results

The New School's FIPSE project plan included the development of a series of instruments which could be used to guide the creation of courses for asynchronous delivery by comparing classroom courses with on-line iterations of the same course with the same instructor, thus informing us as to the relative strengths and weaknesses of each method. Our assessment process has grown into one which focuses both on the quality of the learning experience and the effectiveness of the learning itself.

Throughout the project, our evaluation and assessment activities have been designed and implemented by a team from the University of Michigan. The foci of their efforts fall into the following categories:

Summative Evaluation

For the overall project, attempt to discover and illustrate the benefits of the on-line curriculum and the innovative technological delivery systems upon:

(a) the interest and enthusiasm of adult students concerning the subject matter and methods of delivery;

(b) the learning and development that occurs as a result of the course content and the technologies used for delivering the course;

(c) the quality and creativity of the students' work;

(d) the strengths and limitations of the course content and the technologically-mediated delivery systems a judged by the students;

(e) the opinions of the faculty concerning the planning process, the technological delivery of the courses, and the quality of the process and outcomes; and

(f) the impact of this method of planing and delivering courses upon the quality of intellectual life for adult students and for faculty.

Formative Evaluation

Throughout the project, fine-tune and, where needed overhaul the instructional materials and technological delivery systems to facilitate the optimum use, quality, and learning of students. Issues addressed include:

(a) How can products and delivery systems be made more user-friendly, attractive, and more desirable to use?

(b) How can the sequencing and instructional materials be improved to enhance student understanding and interest?

(c) What is the quality of the instructional materials and how can that be improved?

(d) How can materials and delivery systems be adjusted to make them more compatible and accessible for existing users and more available for potential users?

Thus far, instructors' evaluations indicate that students in DIAL courses do as well as or better than students in on-campus interactions of the same classes. The instructors feel that this is a result of the closer, more intense experience as well as the more naturally collaborative environment. Departmental and DIAL investigation of comfort levels with the delivery mode demonstrate conclusively that while students clearly resent technical problems, they are forgiving of these if they are otherwise happy with the class.

We have also gleaned some interesting information about learning processes. The nature of asynchronous learning programs supports students who are either *self-directed* or who need an *internal structure* to their learning activities. The reasons for this flexibility lies in the fact that participation is user-initiated. Students can see the computer conference as an evolving resource, in which questions and answers are posted and over which the individual has substantial control; these learners set their own objectives and use the process to reach those objectives. Alternatively, students can see the environment as an internally-structured one, in which topics are presented sequentially and developed simultaneously with specific goals at each step. Learners who feel the need of external structure (rules and requirements) and the discipline of a regular schedule will obviously be less comfortable.

Our faculty/course development model specifically leads to the creation of asynchronous courses which effectively challenge students to develop new cognitive abilities. Specifically, we have found that because students can come and go as their own needs dictate, the development of their critical thinking capabilities is enhanced . . . they can try out new ideas, talk with each other at any time, and learn from not only the content but the structure of the instructor's presentations. The challenge is to draw the students quickly into the course environment and thus make them a part of the process, rather than just observers. The "leveling effect" — which encourages shy participants as it subdues more aggressive ones — is a major benefit of on-line education.

Students report that the intensity and intimacy of the on-line classroom is highly stimulating. Following the development of a course over its eight-week duration, one can see evidence that this tight focus stimulates a variety of learning processes and cognitive responses.

Observation suggests strongly that adult students find the experience particularly rewarding because of the fast pace and quick feedback, which may enable the development of new knowledge over a much shorter time frame. As we've said, the inherent flexibility of asynchronous learning appeals to students for whom education is voluntary and to be pursued on a part-time basis. Because The New School student is by definition an adult degree or continuing higher education student; this is the group that most specifically appreciates and responds favorably to less structure. Our students also indicate that a rich offering coupled with flexible access defines for them an overall program which meets both felt and unperceived needs. It is for this reason that we have developed the fullness of our offering as quickly as we have.

It is also quite clear that students in our type of program — one focused on social sciences and humanities as opposed to technology or engineering — resent the intrusion of technology into the learning process. They don't see the interaction itself, through a keyboard and screen, as technology; it's a communication channel which, as long as it works, is invisible. But when a problem arises which interferes with the interaction, then the environment is visible technology and a barrier problem.

DIAL staff and department administrators regularly review the assessment results as it comes in. Although we have yet to develop a formal assessment-review-change-assess process (largely because the volume of data is so great) we are able to act quickly to address specific problems, build on strengths and eliminate weaknesses. Departments continue to review the evaluations of on-campus classes with those from DIAL to find areas of both positive and negative feeling. This process, too, is still being formed.

The objective of our assessment activities, obviously, is to fuel continuous improvement in content and delivery of our program. This breaks down into foci on structural and academic issues (functional), technical and administrative issues (managerial) and student satisfaction and performance issues (ethical). None of these foci has precedence over the others; without a firm commitment to improvement in all three areas, we feel that our experiment in asynchronous learning could devolve into simply another application of educational technology rather than a parallel delivery system for the university's product.

Continuation and dissemination: We intend to continue the development of our DIAL course offerings by adding more courses and degrees as time and resources permit. The New School sees distance learning and the delivery of programming to adult students though this vehicle as the natural enhancement of its mission in the coming decades. We are working on a number of projects which will be disseminated to the higher education community as they come to conclusion. Among these are (a) a model program for faculty development (the focus of our 1995-1998 FIPSE grant), (b) student orientation and training, and (c) models for collaboration between and among institutions through distance technologies. We held a conference in November 1995 which was attended by over 250 college and university administrators. We presented our FIPSE project work and conclusions at this meeting, and we intend to continue this conference as an annual activity if our resources permit. Finally, we are committed to using the new technologies, specifically the World Wide Web, to keep colleagues abreast of various activities in the field of distance education for adult learners, and to stimulate further discussion and discovery.

F. Summary and Conclusions

The New School was the perfect environment in which to tackle the aims of this project. Since its inception in 1919, we have evolved into a premiere adult education center, offering thousands of courses per year to adult students. Our faculty is exclusively part-time. For several years we had been offering a small number of courses via computer conferencing and we understood the affinity between our traditional program and the text-based computer conferencing environment. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we had the institutional commitment to change and the ability to adjust quickly to that change.

Built on this basis, and with the contributions of many good and talented people, our FIPSE project was a success. We achieved our primary goals, and although our project is still a work-in-progress, we can see the ultimate achievement of our larger objective: to make the full offering of our adult degree programs available to students anywhere, anytime, without sacrificing the richness and rigor of a traditional classroom experience at The New School. Our BA program came fully on-line this Spring (1996) and we anticipate more credit programs and degrees moving to the distance environment in the years ahead.

As an institution, the most important lesson of this project has been this: the decision to commit to distance learning is one which will fundamentally and irrevocably change the way in which the institution thinks about itself as an organization, about its faculty and students and the relationships it has to these groups, and about its mission. We have had to re-think hundreds of aspects of our administrative and operating policies to address the needs of the project. For example:

intellectual property: once courses are committed to a recorded medium, is there an issue of "ownership" to be addressed?

teaching load: if an instructor works at home, on his or her own time, should the course count the same in terms of load limits and requirements as classroom courses?

employment status: is an instructor who teaches only on-line, from his or her own premises, with his or her own equipment, an employee or a contractor?

student health: should students living and working in other states be subject to the rules and regulations of the institution's home state; specifically, just because New York requires a measles shot of students here, must we require that of student who live and study from Kansas?

regulatory issues: does our license to issue degrees, granted by the Regents of The University of the State of New York, entitle us to issue degrees to students who have done all their work outside New York?

academic oversight: what is the on-line version of visiting a class for observation prposes? Should teacher evaluations be different?

These are just a few of the many issues which came to the surface as we developed our program. Obviously, some are of major importance and some of less importance. Planning and development of distance education should begin with an assumption that the university's strengths and enduring values can be adjusted structurally so that the qualitative essentials – faculty, scholarly capacities, and pedagogies – can be extended to reach students not now being served. Quality in distance education should equal that of the best traditional campus instruction, because the faculty, pedagogies and resources of the physical campus can be made practically available to the off-campus student. Over time, the long-standing distinctions between localized and off-campus study, whether in the home, workplace, library or community center, will diminish in importance.

These observations define an important role for distance learning as a vehicle through which the University can extend its reach to a larger and more varied population. The development of a flexible and responsive distance learning capability which embraces the unique curricular and intellectual development opportunities for which the institution is well-known will enable the University to create alternative structures and programs to increase access for those unable or unwilling to study on campus. It will allow the expansion of academic content which is responsive to individual purposes and to emerging social needs. It will ensure access to quality educational opportunities for adult degree programs, career education, and information/arts programming. In these ways, distance learning provides an opportunity not to change but to expand on the objectives of the institution's mission to focus on and bring to students an ability to be critically reflective about issues confronting society and individuals in their everyday lives.

Another major institutional issue concerns the administrative positioning of the distance learning program within the university. This must be achieved in such a way that the academic thrust of the program is emphasized, and that adequate funding, staffing, control and freedom are afforded the program to ensure a successful effort. In addition, constant and effective communication between the administrative center of the program and the faculty and students involved is essential. With its great diversity of activities and staffing, the nature of its students, and the types of faculty and intramural relationships necessary for effective operation, information must flow in such a manner that all parties are apprised of common goals, activities and procedures and appropriate feedback is available whenever necessary.

One approach to the location of the distance learning initiative would be to locate it within the institution's central administration. Functioning as a service much as does the library, the program offices would be able to offer support directly to the various divisions as needed. There are some clear advantages to this, chief among which is the relative ease with which divisions could call on the central unit for support in the development of their distance programs.

At The New School, we determined that the question of where the distance learning program should reside should focus on the relative degree of use of the facilities by the various divisions, as well as on the ability of the divisions to work together to their mutual advantage. Locating the program in the division which serves adult students would enable us to bring its long history of experience and success in adult education and non-traditional delivery to the development of distance learning. Our division will clearly be the major user of the services, and bringing experience and skill to bear, might be the most effect purveyor of those services throughout the University. At other types of institutions, this might not be the right decision.

Finally, no institution should start down this path without considering the budgetary impact. Distance learning programs are expensive. Efficiencies can be sought and the occasional corner cut, but the technologies and marketing requirements of a broad-based distance learning program are such that substantial sums of money will need to be spent to set up and maintain the operation. Also, distance learning requires ongoing faculty development and instructional design support, as well additional expense in course development and materials dissemination. Finally, a commitment to the simplest possible level of end-user (student) technology implies additional expense on the sender's end to deliver the most sophisticated programming.

Revenue potential is equally substantial. Effective marketing to a target groups defined by their needs and interests and guided by similarity to campus-based demographics, should yield a high level of participation. Responsive programming and thorough support will assure that students have good experiences with the distance environment, and this will develop a solid reputation for and interest in our programming.

As the costs of starting up the program and the capital investment in initial technologies begins to be amortized, and the number of participants begins to grow, the impact on the institution's "bottom line" should begin to be positive and impressive. Issues to be considered include how to price tuition and fees, and how to best allocate expenses and revenues across the departments and divisions which will produce the programming and the distance learning service component.

In conclusion, we have learned that improved access to higher education will draw adult students to a technologically-mediated delivery system, but that the growth and development of that system will relate to the degree to which students feel they are getting all the benefits and value of a "traditional" education. The challenge to institutions considering this path is to find ways to address this need.

Appendices

Appended to this report are the following:

- *Statistical Analysis of Pilot Course Evaluations.* This in-depth compilation of evaluation methodologies and results was produced by our assessment partners from the University of Michigan

- Brochures from each of the semesters in which DIAL courses were offered during the term of the FIPSE grant; these demonstrate the growth of the program and the impact of project findings on program development.

- A promotional videotape used to interest adult BA students in participating in DIAL courses.

- Sample of current course packet

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH: INTERDISCIPLINARY DISTANCE CORE CURRICULUM FOR ADULT LEARNERS

FUNDED BY THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN EVALUATION

PREPARED BY MICHAEL T. NETTLES. PH.D
AND SIRKKA A. KAUFFMAN

WINTER, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HIGHLIGHTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

1......... History of the New School Project
1......... Project Context
2......... Evaluation and Distance Learning

II. EVOLUTION OF THE EVALUATION

5......... Development of Evaluation Plan for 1993-1995
7......... Data Collection and Analysis History

III. RESULTS

11....... Student Surveys
11.................... Questionnaire Summary 1993-1994
18.................... Questionnaire Summary 1994-1995
22....... Faculty Surveys and Interviews
22.................... Highlights from 1993-1994
24.................... Highlights from 1994-1995

IV. DISCUSSION

29....... Student Recruitment and Services
30....... Faculty Development
31....... Curricular Issues
32....... Technological Issues

34........V. DISSEMINATION PLAN

36....... REFERENCES

APPENDICES

A INSTRUMENTS

B. DATA

HIGHLIGHTS

PROPOSAL CONTEXT

The New School for Social Research proposed a pioneering initiative to develop, deliver and evaluate a set of courses to be taught first in a classroom setting and subsequently in an on-line environment. This initiative had several unique aspects:

- At the time of the proposal, distance learning was a specialized, relatively unknown quantity, particularly in the context of degree program offerings.
- The faculty selected to develop the courses had only taught in a traditional classroom setting previously.
- As adjunct faculty, the New School faculty involved in the project were not typical of faculty in other institutions, who may be expected to have more resources available for development of courses with new technologies.
- The courses to be developed were in humanities and social science disciplines, which were unusual targets for experimentation outside of a traditional classroom setting.
- Formative and summative evaluation components were built into the project framework.

MAJOR EVALUATION FINDINGS

- Students in both settings took courses mainly because of content-related reasons.
- Students in on-line courses were also interested in learning how to use technology.
- Students in each setting had a preference for course delivery in that setting.
- Student satisfaction with courses in both settings was primarily related to their impressions of faculty communication.
- Faculty who developed the project courses reported more positive experiences teaching them on-line than did faculty who had not developed the courses themselves.
- Faculty's expectations of the quality and quantity of student contributions to on-line discussions were not met.
- Faculty felt that more specific advice and preparation was needed in the future to develop or transfer existing courses to an on-line environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications for the New School and other institutions considering implementing or expanding distance learning offerings fall under the following four categories:

- Student recruitment and services, including possible redefinition of the market, and an analysis of the differential services required by students in courses at a distance.
- Faculty development, including the need for specific training to adapt, develop and teach courses for delivery outside of a traditional classroom setting.
- Curricular issues, including encouragement of optimum student contribution in an on-line environment, and student readiness for such an environment.
- Technological issues, including consideration of technology needs to support the desired number of courses offered at a distance, and the necessary training and support personnel for students and faculty.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) funded the three year distance core curriculum pilot program in 1992 at the New School for Social Research, and the University of Michigan was a sub-contractor conducting the evaluation component of the project. This is the report of the evaluation activities, results, and findings.

During the project's first year (1992-93), three New School faculty were selected to develop a total of three new courses to constitute the core curriculum. During the fall semester of the second year (1993-94), each of the three faculty transferred the course (s)he developed for delivey in a classroom setting to a course with identical content to be offered on-line over a computer network during the spring semester. During the third year (1994-95), three different faculty taught these three courses on-line, one course in the fall semester and two courses in the spring semester.

The Univesity of Michigan's evaluation team's involvement began towards the end of the first year, and continued through the end of the project. As part of the pilot design, evaluators collected data on student characteristics, attitudes, behaviors, and learning. The data collected were intended to be useful in helping faculty of the future to design their curricula better, to help students make more informed choices, and to help the New School market the program to appropriate students. The foci of the dataa were upon student learning, student attitudes, the preferences of faculty in teaching with and using new technology, and reasons for students' choices of courses offered by distance learning versus traditional classroom methods.

The data collected on student attitudes and behaviors in on-line versus classroom courses, as well as the data on faculty attitudes and behaviors in those courses have implications for both the New School and other institutions serving students through various media. These institutions may include colleges and universities serving either traditional or adult students, and may also include other institutions and corporations offering training programs to adults.

Major implications fall under the following categories: student recruitment and services; faculty development; curricular issues; and technological issues. While the data from this relatively small pilot project are not conclusive enough for institutions to make major decisions, it does provide clear indications of several issues that need to be addressed before embarking on or expanding distance education activities.

For example, prior to beginning or expanding an existing distance learning program, the institution needs to consider important issues in student recruitment and student services. A broad discussion of the mission of the institution and the type(s) of students it wishes to serve should frame any narrower questions of student recruitment and retention services. Any data that an institution could collect to segment their potential market for distance learning programs would be useful in decision-making. Such data should also address whether such a program might simply drain students from existing classroom options. Recruitment methods for different market segments would need to be evaluated in order to assess their cost and efficiency. Similarly, any additional or revised student services that would be needed by distance learning students should be addressed up front in terms of costs and availability.

This project has also shown that faculty who develop and teach on-line courses cannot be expected to do so well without some training in adapting courses from a traditional classroom to on-line delivery. Asking very experienced faculty, deeply committed to their disciplines and their students, to teach on-line courses does not by itself guarantee a smooth transition to alternative methods and media. Add to this the likely possibility that faculty may be asked or may want to teach a course on-line before they have ever offered it in a classroom, and the issue becomes more complex.

Institutions are likely to benefit from devising some method of training faculty to both develop and teach on-line courses. Any institution interested in on-line course development and teaching needs to address such faculty issues for all faculty who may be involved. This would include issues of release time to develop courses, evaluation of faculty in on-line versus traditional classroom environments, as well as faculty recruitment and promotion paths that may differ for those primarily involved in on-line environments. In addition, a broader issue of who should develop courses for on-line delivery should be addressed.

In addition, there are distinct curricular issues raised by the technology of on-line courses. One concerns the time frame for offering on-line courses. When implementing distance learning courses, institutions need to be aware of the impact on both faculty and students of overall timing and sequencing of assignments in on-line courses. This is particularly true when considering on-line instruction for the first time. The traditional semester or quarter structure cannot be assumed to be the appropriate one for on-line courses.

This issue of student comprehension in, and preparation for on-line courses is a broader one that also needs some institutional forethought. The related issues of "attendance" and contribution to on-line courses need to be discussed. Faculty need to have tools available to threaten or to reward students for such participation, whereas in a traditional classroom setting they felt much more in control of the class. The sequencing of course materials, assignments, and on-line discussion presents another issue for faculty to deal with when managing the on-line courses.

Finally, while technological issues are normally the ones explicitly addressed by institutions considering implementing or expanding on-line course delivery, this project found that the extent of those issues are likely to be underestimated. In general, these issues deal with technical needs to handle the actual course delivery, with faculty training to use that technology, and with student use of the technology they need to connect to the institution's technological delivery system.

In each of these three areas, this project indicated that advanced planning, and particularly the flexibility to change administrative procedures in the event of technical problems are critical to the success of distance learning instruction. While it can be anticipated that with time institutions will become more competent in dealing with new and better technology, the reality for the immediate future is that extensive technical expertise will be necessary to support on-line course delivery.

In addition to the administrative and technical support necessary to get the course materials on-line, the remaining two issues of faculty and student training and support need to be anticipated. Neither faculty nor students can be expected to make the most efficient use of the new technology without training and extensive support. For students in particular, who may physically be located around the country or the world, ongoing access to technical support services may be critical to successful course participation. Planning such training and support into the programs is often anticipated, but without a real sense of the nature and extent of such support.

I. INTRODUCTION

HISTORY OF NEW SCHOOL PROJECT

This is the final report of the evaluation activities carried out by the University of Michigan evaluation team for the project "An Interdisciplinary Core Curriculum for the Adult Learner." The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) funded the three year pilot program in 1992 at the New School for Social Research, and the University of Michigan was a sub-contractor for conduct of the evaluation component of the proposed project. During the first year (1992-93), three New School faculty were selected to develop a total of three courses to constitute the core curriculum. During the second year (1993-94), each of the faculty taught the course (s)he developed in a classroom setting in the fall semester, and on-line over a computer network during the spring semester. During the third year (1994-95), different faculty taught these three courses on-line, one course in the fall semester and two courses in the spring semester. Faculty were supported in their course development and delivery by the New School's Distance Instruction for Adult Learners (DIAL) staff for the purpose of preparing to deliver the courses on-line.

The evaluation team's involvement began towards the end of the first year, and continued through the end of the project. For a full discussion of the evaluation plan and activities, see Section II. The three courses developed specifically for the FIPSE project are referred to throughout this report as the "project courses," and were the major focus of the evaluation activities. Section II, however, illustrates that the evaluation focus was broadened to include other humanities and social sciences courses offered on-line by the New School during 1994-95.

PROJECT CONTEXT

When planning for this project was begun in the early 1990s, distance education was still viewed as a promising yet mostly unexplored option for educating students within a liberal arts degree program. The technology, while also promising, was still relatively costly in terms of the necessary investment by institutions and the students who might participate in distance learning programs. Today, in 1995, the technical sophistication of students and faculty continues to increase, while at the same time the required technology becomes less expensive and more sophisticated. But, reports of the experiences of institutions offering distance education courses or programs, particularly those with an evaluation component continue to be scarce.

In a national survey of senior campus administrators conducted by the American Council on Education in 1995, 68% believed that more courses will "very likely" use electronic materials within the next five years, and another 30% thought that was "possible" (Administrators' Views on Changes in Learning Opportunities, 1995). Forty-seven percent of those surveyed believed it "very likely" that more courses will be offered through distance learning within the next five years, with another 37% believing that to be "possible," and only 16% believing it "not likely." Similarly, 36% believed it "very likely" that class assignments will be submitted electronically within the next five years, with another 54% believing it to be "possible." Only ten percent believed it "not likely." These beliefs, coupled with the trends in technical sophistication, equipment availability and lowered expense clearly indicate that many higher education institutions will be faced with decisions concerning the implementation or expansion of distance learning programs into the next century. These decisions are at the heart of an evaluation. This report on the experiences of one institution, is intended to contribute to the discussion of issues that will face those institutions as they debate such programmatic changes.

EVALUATION AND DISTANCE LEARNING

Distance learning technologies provide opportunities for faculty to experiment with a greater variety of course delivery systems, and for students to have more choices in how to take courses and in a wide variety of settings. In addition to choices for teachers and learners, changes in technology provide dilemmas and options for evaluators in assessing the comparative benefits of courses offered in the classroom versus those offered at a distance.

The evaluation of adult education generally, and of distance learning specifically responds to the last few decades of calls from policy-makers and the public for greater accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in American higher education. Although new technologies are becoming more available, affordable, and accepted in institutions as alternatives to traditional classroom modes of course delivery, most such instructional programs have not focused on measuring the comparative impact of different types of courses on adult students' attitudes, behavior, and learning, or on faculty attitudes about technology. In particular, there is a dearth of data from institutions that offer an integrated set of courses by the same faculty through different delivery systems. Because of the lack of systematic comparison of student characteristics, attitudes, behaviors, and learning in such parallel sets of courses, it can be difficult for curriculum designers or individual faculty to know the impact of different delivery systems on their students. As a result, decisions to offer courses by traditional or distance learning techniques are often made without information about the probable outcomes Students also lack valuable information about their prospects for satisfaction and success when electing various modes of course delivery.

This report is from a pilot program which offered a set of interdisciplinary core courses for adult students, allowing them a choice of traditional classroom or distance learning delivery for each course. As part of the pilot design, evaluators collected data on student characteristics, attitudes, behaviors, and learning. The data collected were designed to be useful in the future for better curricular design, more informed student choice, and marketing of the program to appropriate students, specifically by collection of data on students' learning from and attitudes about different instructional delivery systems; the preferences of faculty in teaching with and using new technology; and reasons for students' choices of courses offered by distance learning versus traditional classroom methods.

Distance education researchers have long advocated the inclusion of assessment plans in implementing curricular changes with the aid of technology (Rumble, 1986; Thorpe, 1988; Verduin & Clark, 1991). But, such recommendations have often focused mainly on measuring student learning and increasing access to higher education, with less of a broad-based approach which would include evaluating affective as well as cognitive outcomes, or comparative studies of alternative delivery systems for the same course.

The evaluators in this case study based their assessment plan on two streams of prior research and scholarship. First, the consideration of multiple clients, policy objectives, and objects of assessment were recognized as important in the design and implementation of an evaluation in higher education (Astin, 1991; Worthen & Sanders, 1987). In addition, recent studies evaluating distance learning programs have begun to include data on student satisfaction as well as learning (Kendall & Oaks, 1992), and to consider evaluating components such as course development, technology resources, support, and management in addition to the more traditional instructional component (Harrison, et al., 1991).

II. EVOLUTION OF THE EVALUATION

DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION PLAN FOR 1993-1995

The University of Michigan evaluation team began to develop its evaluation plan using the evaluation foci enumerated in the original proposal to FIPSE. The proposal included separate foci for the summative portion of the evaluation, intended to collect data useful for an overview of the entire project and future recommendations, and for the formative portion, from which data collected throughout the project would guide New School faculty and administrators in revising the project as it unfolded. These foci were:

Summative Evaluation

For the overall project, attempt to discover and illustrate the benefits of the specifically designed curriculum and the innovative technological delivery systems upon:

a) the interest and enthusiasm of adult students concerning the subject matter and methods of delivery;
b) the learning and development that occurs as a result of the course content and the technologies used for delivering the course;
c) the quality and creativity of the students' work;
d) the strengths and limitations of the course content and the technology delivery systems as judged by students;
e) the opinions of the faculty concerning the planning process, the technology delivery of the courses, and the quality of the process and outcomes;
f) the impact of this method of planning and delivering courses upon the quality of intellectual life for adult students and for faculty.

Formative Evaluation

Throughout the project, fine-tune and, where needed, overhaul the instructive materials and technology delivery systems to facilitate the optimum use, quality, and learning of students. Issues to be addressed included:

a) How can products and delivery systems be made more user-friendly, attractive, and more desirable to use?
b) How can the sequencing and instructional materials be improved to enhance student understanding and interest?
c) What is the quality of the instructional materials and how can they be improved?
d) How can materials and delivery systems be adjusted to make them more

compatible and accessible for existing users and more available for potential users?

The resulting evaluation plan was intended to both collect as much data as possible to address the above foci, as well as to allow flexibility in the adaptation of these foci or the development of new ones as the project unfolded. The original evaluation plan was as follows:

Summer 1993

Develop survey instruments for students in the three project courses for beginning and end of term in both classroom and distance learning environments in consultation with New School faculty. Surveys to address primarily Summative evaluation Foci a, b, d, and f.

Develop beginning of term surveys for faculty teaching the three project courses to obtain baseline data on their technology experiences, attitudes and behaviors, addressing Summative evaluation Foci e and f, and all Formative evaluation Foci.

Develop a holistic assessment scale for grading student assignments to be used by the three project course faculty, in consultation with them.

Fall 1993

Administer beginning and end of term surveys to the students in the three project course classrooms.

Administer surveys of faculty in three project courses.

Collect data from faculty on student assignment grading, both on individual assignments using the holistic scale, and grades on such assignments and overall grades.

Revise surveys in consultation with DIAL administrative staff to be administered on-line to students taking the three project courses in the spring semester.

Spring 1994

Conduct preliminary data analyses were conducted on the fall term course survey responses.

Develop faculty telephone interview schedules to address all Formative evaluation foci, and conduct such interviews with the three project course faculty.

Administer beginning and end of term surveys to the students in the three project course classrooms via on-line delivery.

Collect data from faculty on student assignment grading, both on individual assignments using the holistic scale, and grades on such assignments and overall grades.

Summer 1994

Prepare data analysis from fall and spring semester courses, to include description and comparison of student backgrounds, attitudes, behaviors, and achievement both within and across courses and delivery systems.

Prepare analysis of faculty attitudes, beliefs and behaviors throughout this year of project.

Meet with New School administration and faculty to review classroom and on-line experiences in this project year. If necessary, revise data collection instruments and procedures for final project year.

Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

Administer student beginning and end of term surveys for three project courses when offered.

Administer faculty written and/or telephone surveys of experiences in three project courses.

Collect data from faculty on student assignment grading, both on individual assignments using the holistic scale, and grades on such assignments and overall grades.

Summer 1995

Prepare data analysis from students and faculty in 1994-95 project courses. Compare such analyses to data from 1993-94 project courses.

Prepare final report to FIPSE, including suggestions for dissemination to the public.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS HISTORY

Although the original evaluation plan was designed to collect data for all of the evaluation foci in the original New School proposal to FIPSE, as the project progressed it became clear that the New School's focus strictly on a core curriculum was expanding to include other courses, and therefore the project was changing. As a result, the original evaluation plan no longer addressed all of the relevant data collection needs. Simultaneously, unforeseen technical problems with data collection from students in on-line courses forced reevaluation of some of the data collection techniques. Finally, the small numbers of students enrolled in the three project courses, particularly in 1994-95 also precipitated changes in the population of courses from which data would be collected. As a result of these three factors, the evaluation plan was adapted to cope with them, while still attempting to remain true to the original evaluation foci and data collection to the extent possible.

First, during the initial offering of the three project courses in 1993-94 as components of an "interdisciplinary core curriculum for the adult learner," enrollment was restricted to New School baccalaureate degree students, and the initial faculty offering the courses were specifically interested in developing such a core curriculum, as specified in the FIPSE proposal. But, during the subsequent offering of the courses in 1994-95, no such restrictions were made on enrollments, nor was there any mention of the courses being part of a core curriculum in New School literature. In addition, as had been planned, other faculty not involved in the original course development process for this project taught the courses. As a result, it became clear that the evaluation could not address any issues specifically relating to the interrelationships of the three project courses as a core curriculum, since the courses were no longer being offered strictly to the adult degree-seeking population. In particular, comparisons of student learning, backgrounds and attitudes across the two years (1993-94 and 1994-95) would not be meaningful beyond descriptive data possibly focusing on student expectations of and reasons for choosing on-line versus traditional classroom courses.

The second major factor forcing changes in the original evaluation plan was technological. Although the evaluation team had planned to implement all student assessment instruments on-line for all on-line project courses, this proved infeasible. For the spring 1994 courses, both beginning and end-of-term questionnaires were mailed to students in the project courses. For fall 1994 and spring 1995 courses, some questionnaires were administered on-line, while some were mailed to students. Because of the poor response rate from students in the spring 1994 courses, DIAL staff conducted supplementary telephone interviews with some students to collect additional data.

The last major factor impacting the original evaluation plan scope was the small number of students enrolling in the project courses, particularly during 1994-95, despite the lifting of prior enrollment restrictions. Accompanying the drastic reduction in the students enrolled in these three courses was the simultaneous relatively large increase in the total number of students registering in other New School DIAL courses. The DIAL staff was able to administer the on-line questionnaires developed for the project courses to all these students as well. As a result, the evaluation plan was modified to include data collected from students in other humanities and social sciences on-line courses as well as the three project courses. However, again in terms of data analysis, the evaluators would not be able to provide much beyond descriptive information on such students' backgrounds, attitudes, and particularly reasons for choosing on-line courses.

The actual evaluation activities as conducted by the evaluation team are indicated below:

Summer 1993

Survey instruments for beginning and end of term were developed for students in DIAL courses in both classroom and distance learning environments in consultation with New School faculty.

Surveys were developed for faculty teaching the DIAL courses to obtain baseline data on their technology experiences, attitudes and behaviors.

A holistic assessment scale for grading student assignments to be used by DIAL faculty was developed in consultation with them.

Fall 1993

Beginning and end of term surveys were administered to the students in the classrooms.

Surveys were revised in consultation with faculty and DIAL staff, and were designed to be administered on-line to students taking the three courses in the spring semester.

Spring 1994

Preliminary data analyses were conducted on the fall term course survey responses.
New School faculty interview schedules were developed to address all Formative evaluation foci, and interviews with them were conducted by an evaluator.

Students' grades for assignments and courses from the fall term were obtained from DIAL staff.

The revised surveys for beginning and end of term were administered by DIAL staff to students at the beginning of spring term via mail rather than on-line.

Transcripts of on-line course interaction for analysis were requested and received.

Problems Encountered during 1993-94

The use of a holistic assessment scale for student assignments did not prove practical for faculty to use in grading each assignment, and thus only grades for individual assignments and the overall course were collected for each student.

Confusion of students over whether to use New School identification numbers or social security numbers on surveys made it difficult to match responses on student beginning and end of term courses. This problem was resolved with the assistance of DIAL staff.

Due to the nature of the software available on-line, it did not prove feasible to administer the spring term student surveys on-line, and they were mailed to students.

Student course surveys for the spring term had a low response rate in contrast to the fall term, making data comparisons both between and across courses less complete than desirable. The end of term survey was revised to repeat some questions from the beginning of term survey to capture demographic data.

Summer 1994

The evaluators prepared data analysis from fall and spring semester courses, include description and comparison of student backgrounds, attitudes, behaviors, and achievement both within and across courses and delivery systems for 1993-94 project courses.

The evaluators prepared narrative analysis of faculty attitudes, beliefs and behaviors throughout this year of project.

An evaluation team member met with project course faculty in New York to review their entire year experience.

The evaluation team met with DIAL staff in Ann Arbor to review classroom and on-line experiences in this project year, and discuss revision of data collection instruments and procedures for the final project year.

Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

The DIAL staff administered student beginning and end of term surveys for three project courses when offered on-line, as well as from all other humanities and social sciences courses offered on-line, and forwarded a hard copy of the data to the evaluators.

An evaluator administered faculty written or telephone surveys of experiences in the three project courses.

Summer 1995

The evaluators prepared data analysis from students and faculty in 1994-95 project courses, but found it misleading to compare such analyses to data from 1993-94 project courses.

The evaluation team prepared a final report for FIPSE on the evaluation portion of the project.

III. RESULTS

This section presents the results and findings from the evaluation as actually carried out from 1993 to 1995. In the interest of brevity we highlight findings most useful for the discussion in Section IV of implications for institutions planning to implement or expand distance learning programs. Additional detail is provided in Appendix B.

STUDENT SURVEYS AND INTERVIEWS

The original evaluation plan aimed to measure students' attitudes about distance learning, their anticipated and actual behavior in classroom and on-line course sections, their satisfaction with those courses, and their learning in them. Because of the small number of students in the three original project courses, as well as the lack of a relevant control group of students, this evaluation is unable to draw meaningful comparisons about student learning in the courses. However, the data on students' behavior and their satisfaction with the courses and the delivery medium are useful for future planning.

Thus, we report findings about student attitudes, behavior and satisfaction from the beginning and end of term questionnaires, as highlighted below. A full report of results from the students questionnaires appears in Appendix B.

Questionnaire Summary 1993-1994

(NOTE: All data for 1993-1994 are from the three FIPSE project courses. The fall term 1993 courses were taught in a classroom by the original project faculty. In the spring term 1994, the same faculty each taught the same course on-line. Fall term respondents total 36, and spring term respondents total 19. These represent approximately 95% of fall term and 65% of spring term enrollees in the project courses.)

Highlights from the Beginning of Term Questionnaire

Closed-ended questions

For both fall and spring term students, the most important reason for deciding to enroll in the project course was "out of interest in the subject," as 69% of fall term and 47% of spring term respondents indicated. This reason overshadowed the other possible reasons in both semesters: "to help fulfill requirements for a baccalaureate degree"(11% in fall and 21% in spring); "to take a course from this faculty member" (8% in fall and 16% in spring); and the tuition discount offered for the project course (8% in fall and 16% in spring).

In terms of student expectations as to how often they planned to conduct certain activities, no major differences were evident between fall and spring term students in the following: participating in social activities with other students on or off campus, discussing career plans with an advisor, or study with other students in the enrolled course. There were differences between the students' expectations of participation in two computer-related activities. In the fall term, only 8% expected to use a computer daily to help complete assignments, and 42% weekly, in contrast to spring term students, of whom 47% expected to do so daily and 37% weekly. In the fall, the vast majority, 78% expected to communicate with other New School students via computer at most once during the term, while of spring term students, 21% expected to do so daily, 47% weekly, and 11% every other week.

In the fall term project courses, students expressed a strong preference for taking the course in a classroom setting (53%) over a distance learning method (14%). 33% were unsure. In the spring, only 1 student expressed a preference for taking the course in a classroom, with 47% preferring the on-line method. 32% were unsure.

Students in the fall term courses had been using computers somewhat longer than those in the spring: a mean of close to 6 years compared to about 4 years. However, the fall term students rated themselves as lower on levels of expertise and comfort in using computers than did the spring term students. In both groups, the means were between 2 and 3 on a scale of from 1 = Low to 5 = High.

Demographic characteristics of students did not differ markedly with one exception. Students in the spring term courses expected to work more hours a week at their job, on average, than the fall term students. 22% of fall term students did not plan to work at all, compared to only 1 spring term student. 53% of spring term students expected to work more than 40 hours a week, compared to 39% of fall term students. Despite this, there was not a significant difference in the proportion of full and part-time students in the two semesters. While 31% of fall term students indicated they were enrolled full-time, 26% of spring term students did so. In both groups, 68% indicated they were enrolled part-time. However, the reported income ranges of the students differed as expected. With the larger proportion of students not employed in the fall, 36% reported incomes under $25,000 while only 16% of spring term students did so.

Open-ended questions: Fall Term courses (in classroom)

Intellectual Goals

Nearly all students responded to the question asking for intellectual goals for the course, and all dealt with content issues. Sample comments:

"to ground myself as I gain more knowledge of the topic,"
"gain a familiarity with the writings under discussion,"
"an insight into the way a course is put together," and
"a broader interdisciplinary experience."

Social Goals

Less than half the students responded to the question asking for social goals for the course. Of those who did, comments were split as to social goals within the course and a broader perspective of meeting new people. Examples of class social goals: "have good and stimulating discussions on the topic," and "contrasting opinions/perspectives." Examples of broader goals: "to socialize in a more bohemian orbit," and "meeting people from different categories of New York as opposed to the mass of art students I meet in other classes."

Elaboration of preference for course on-line or in a classroom

Six students indicated a preference for on-line delivery. Of those with comments, two noted it would be because of "time management reasons," and two for "the novelty of it." Nineteen students preferred the classroom, and most comments related to "class interaction being the key to a good experience," "the necessity for an instructor," or "something about the content of this course which would make it impossible to learn without an exchange of ideas face-to face." Only one commented about the method of delivery, noting that "it would take much more effort and time to type out all of one's ideas and opinions."

The remainder who were not sure which they would prefer had a majority noting that they simply "did not have the experience to compare," although many indicated a willingness to take courses on-line. One felt that "the course might need drastic changes before it could be offered on-line." Two felt that the "level of interaction" would be lower on-line, leading to a possibly "impersonal feeling." One noted that "I am not sure if I would be disciplined enough to take a class through distance learning."

Open-ended questions: Spring Term courses (on-line)

Intellectual Goals

All responses dealt with content of the course, with the most common goals relating to gaining further knowledge of a particular discipline. 5 students also specifically mentioned that they wanted to learn more about technology itself.

Typical comments (content): "attraction to the diverse subject matter," "exposure to authors that I otherwise would not have," "to further my knowledge of, and interest in, modern culture," "gain a perspective on the roots of sociology," "a deeper understanding of the relation and construction of identity."

Typical comments (course delivery): "to begin using a computer," interested in computer technology and the many changes it will bring about in education," " I wanted the skill of computer conferencing."

Social Goals

Only 6 students responded that they had any social goals. Because of the small number, below are quotes from all:

"to communicate with and meet others who are interested in the same subjects,"

"a better understanding of how a technologically driven society might seem less predestined in the impact on quality of life,"
"broaden my horizon to aid in my ability to understand and participate in a social conversation about art and literature,"
"curious to see what it's like to communicate through a modem,"
"polishing up of my epistolary writing skills,"
"read, receive, hear and respond to the thoughts of others - even though I can't see them."

Elaboration of preference for course on-line or in a classroom

The one student who preferred the classroom said that despite that preference, "I do consider this set-up an opportunity to become more comfortable with computer technology." Of the 9 students who preferred taking the course by distance stressed, 8 convenience reasons, and 1 thought it "more exciting this way, offering the possibility of more composed responses than the classroom." Those mentioning convenience most often noted comments such as: "I have a tight schedule," "I cannot travel to New York weekly," "eliminates time pressure," "frees up my evenings for other appointments," and "it saves time and money."

The one student who had no preference felt that "as long as a student completes all assignments and readings and participates in discussions, value can be obtained whether live or distance learning."

Of the six who were not sure which method they preferred, 4 noted that it was too early for them to be able to specify a preference until after the class was over. One noted that "your familiarity with the subject will dictate how hard or easy a course will be on-line."

Highlights from End of Term Course Evaluation

Closed-ended questions

For many of the questions focusing on student satisfaction and impressions of the course they took, no differences emerged in the two semesters. And while some individual items showed contrasting satisfactions of fall versus spring term students, there was no overall pattern to those differences.

No major differences were indicated in fall and spring term student responses to questions about having had access to materials needed for the course; the professor being an effective communicator; the intellectual stimulation of the course; the professor's sensitivity to student needs; the sense of community among the students in the course; the professor's impact on intellectual development; the student's confidence in making the right choice in taking the course; or the student's own intellectual development in the course.

Differences emerged in several items. In the spring, more students believed that the course was difficult for them than in the fall, when 37% indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. More fall students believed they had sufficient one on one communication with the professor than students in the spring. Fewer spring term students felt it was important for them to graduate with a degree from the New School. Few fall term students (16%) indicated a preference for taking the course again at a distance, whereas 27% of spring term students did. 26% of spring term students believed that it was difficult to communicate with other students taking the course, while 58% of fall students believed such communication was not difficult. More spring term students felt that the course would be of equal quality and value regardless of how it was taught than fall term students.

As expected, spring term students reported higher use of computers to help complete assignments, with 57% using it daily and 16% weekly, in contrast to fall term students (3% daily and 20% weekly). Similarly, 11% of spring term students indicated they communicated with other students by computer daily, and another 26% weekly, whereas no fall term students reported daily or weekly communication, and only 1 student monthly communication. 6% of fall term students indicated studying for the course with others every other week, and 8% monthly, whereas no spring term students reported such study interaction. Fall term students reported working an average of 28 hours a week at their jobs, in contrast to the 36 hours reported for spring term students. There were no other major differences in reported student behaviors during the term.

Student satisfaction with the project courses showed some major differences, but for most questions results were similar. In rating satisfaction on a scale from 1 = Very unsatisfied to 5 =

Very satisfied, fall and spring term students rated the following aspects relatively similarly: communications with the professor (4.29 in fall and 3.91 in spring); method of course delivery (4.27 and 3.91); faculty-student relations (4.29 and 4.09); and student relations with each other (3.58 and 3.36). Major differences were in responses about quality of instruction (4.32 in fall and 4.64 in spring); quality of course materials (4.12 and 4.64); students' intellectual development (4.10 and 4.73); access to library resources (3.87 and 3.22); and access to technological/computer resources (2.96 and 3.90).

In terms of students' levels of comfort and expertise in using personal computers, the fall term students rated themselves higher than the spring term students on both dimensions, though the actual differences were minimal.

In the spring term only, an item asked about the student's preference for taking the course in a classroom or at a distance, and only 1 student reported a preference for the classroom, with 37% indicating a preference for distance delivery. Sixteen percent had no preference, and 1 student was unsure.

Open-ended questions: Spring Term courses (on-line)

(Note: There were no open-ended questions in the Fall term questionnaire.)

Satisfying aspects of course

Comments were equally divided among content, instructor, and method of delivery. Examples of each:

Content comments: "reading was wonderful," "cumulative effect of preparation was enlightening and satisfying," "well-organized."

Instructor comments: "instructor kept it interesting," "guest professors were varied in viewpoints and enthusiastic," "professor was excellent guide."

Method comments: "convenience of flexible schedule," "fun to join in an unconventional classroom," "comforting working with a computer."

Unsatisfying aspects of course

Only 7 had comments for this question, summarized below:

"We needed more lecture. There was too much work for the course - hard to keep up."

"I thought several students were not as interested as I in intellectual development."
"Trying to get on-line in beginning was extremely difficult."
"One guest teacher provoked hostility from some students. He was personally offensive."
"The nature of discourse was definitely affected by the nature of the course presentation."
"I simply did not and do not have the computer expertise to be comfortable in the course."
"Our class had difficulty interacting with each other, both on the class material and on a more casual basis."

Questionnaire Summary 1994-1995

NOTE: The data reported below for 1994-1995 are from the three FIPSE project courses and approximately twenty other non-FIPSE DIAL courses in the social sciences and humanities. Because of the small number of students enrolled in the FIPSE courses, and because of the availability of data from all other DIAL courses, the evaluation team decided to include data from related disciplines within the scope of the evaluation for the project's last year. However, the reporting of this data is not meant so much to draw comparisons of the experiences of students in FIPSE versus non-FIPSE courses as it is to add to the base knowledge about all the students' attitudes, behavior, and satisfaction with on-line courses at the New School.

As planned, all three of the project courses were taught by a different faculty member than those teaching them in 1993-94. Because of the small number of students originally enrolled in the FIPSE courses (6 in the fall and 11 in the spring), and the even smaller number of students completing those courses and completing questionnaires (3 in the fall and 6 in the spring), both the fall and spring term data is combined. The 9 respondents in the FIPSE course represent 53% of the total enrollment in those courses in 1994-95. The 58 respondents from other DIAL courses include students from a cross-section of both fall and spring term social science and humanities courses. Because of technical problems in the administration of on-line questionnaires, not all questions from the prior year were asked of students in 1994-95. In particular, because many of the students completed shorter evaluation instruments which did not contain open-ended items at the end of the term, no end of term open-ended responses are reported.

Highlights from Beginning of Term Questionnaire Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

Closed-ended questions

In terms of student expectations of carrying out certain activities during the term, differences emerged between students in the FIPSE project courses and students in other DIAL social science and humanities courses in nearly all items. The one exception was that there was no expected difference in the use of a computer to complete assignments in the two groups. However, non-FIPSE students had higher expected participation in social activities on and off campus, attendance at and participation in cultural events, discussion of career plans with an advisor, studying with other students in the course, and communicating with other New School students via computer than did students in the FIPSE courses.

While 22% of FIPSE students expressed a preference for the course taught in a classroom and the same proportion for distance methods, the non-FIPSE students had a wider range of responses, with 24% unsure. While FIPSE students had used computers longer than non-FIPSE students (5.33 years versus 4.56 years), they still indicated lower levels of comfort and expertise in using computers. In particular, the comfort level of non-FIPSE students was much higher (3.31 versus 2.00 for FIPSE students).

Because of the large number of non-respondents to demographic items, it is inappropriate to compare these two groups on such variables. However, it is interesting to note that the non-FIPSE students reflect a wide range of ages and income levels.

Open-ended questions

Reasons for taking course

The responses below were received from four students in the FIPSE courses:

"Ability to attend classes on my own time. Adventure of being on-line is a new thing."
"Personal interest, technology."
"I wish to become more computer literate, and I am pregnant so this course affords me the convenience of completing course work at home."
"My variable work schedule."

Responses to this question were received from nearly all students in the non-FIPSE courses. They typically fell into one or more of three main categories, dealing with convenience issues, computers and technology, or comments relating to the content of the course. It should be noted that close to half of the respondents mentioned more than one of these reasons.

Examples of convenience-related comments:

"I travel a lot."
"Because of my work schedule it was easiest for me."
"Dislike commuting."
"Limited free time."
A way to attend another class without taking up work time."

Examples of responses addressing technology:

"I like to use my computer."
"Interested in technology of distance learning."
"Wanted experience on Internet."
"My lack of knowledge in computer systems. I have been trying to find some kind of course to teach myself about computers."
"I liked the idea of learning at home and the way the material is presented, I mean the format."
"Curiosity to see how an on-line course would work."
"Previous on-line experience."
"The idea of free exchange of ideas but with time to consider others' answers and responses with time to write my own."

Examples of content-related reasons:

"The nature of the course, the caliber of the faculty."
"I needed this course to complete my master's degree and this was the only elective available."
"Interesting course selection."
"I wanted to take the class that was offered."

Intellectual goals

Only four of the FIPSE students responded to this open-ended item, as detailed below:

"Enrich my knowledge of modern information theory, expand my contacts and theories , continue acquiring credits towards an embarrassingly unfinished undergraduate degree, check out the New School as potential finishing university."
"1) Course material is intellectually stimulating. 2) To expand academic knowledge, background through "new" reading. 3) To comparatively/practically evaluate electronic course (in relation to other courses, systems, moderators, strategies, etc.)"
"I am a psychology major and feel this class may offer knowledge that will aid me in my chose field."
"Better understanding of the world we live in and greater understanding of my self."

Students enrolled in non-FIPSE courses tended to respond to this item in one or more of three ways. Some focused mainly on the content of the particular course, while others answered more broadly about how the course fit in with the rest of their goals. A smaller group noted the desire to learn how to use technology or curiosity about distance learning in general. Again, many students addressed more than one of these issues in their response.

Examples of specific content-related responses include:

"To write more."

"To be exposed to this subject matter and to interact with someone who has done some thinking about it."
"To learn all I can on this particular subject."

Examples of broader responses include:

"To finish my last four credits and get my BA."
"To get a better grounding in my education."
"Hoping to be back in school again in the near future and looked for a class to get me back in school mode."
"I need the credit to transfer to my school."

Examples of technology-related responses include:

"Hands on distance learning."
"Learn how to operate in an on-line environment."

Highlights from End of Term Course Evaluations Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

Closed-ended questions

In the items asking for student agreement or disagreement regarding their experiences in the on-line courses, several differences emerged between FIPSE and non-FIPSE students. A much larger proportion (62%) in non-FIPSE courses believed their professor was an effective communicator than in FIPSE courses (22%). Similarly, a majority (55%) of non-FIPSE course students felt the course they took was intellectually stimulating compared to 22% of FIPSE students. However, on average, non-FIPSE students believed their professor less sensitive to their interests than FIPSE students did. More FIPSE students felt that it was difficult to communicate with other students in the course than students in non-FIPSE courses. FIPSE students also reported, on average, lower satisfaction with their working relationship with the professor and meeting their intellectual goals than students in non-FIPSE courses. All FIPSE students responding disagreed that the course would be of equal quality whether taught in a classroom or at a distance, while non-FIPSE students' responses indicated more agreement with the statement.

There were few major differences in students' reported frequency of activities during the term. FIPSE students did report more frequent participation in social activities both on and off campus with other students, as well as communication with other New School students via computer.

Similarly, few difference emerged in student satisfaction with the FIPSE versus non-FIPSE courses. FIPSE students rated their communications with their professor much lower than non-FIPSE students (2.00 versus 4.27 on a scale of 1 = Very unsatisfied to 5 = Very satisfied). Non-FIPSE students were more satisfied than FIPSE students with the quality of their instruction (4.27 versus 3.00), and faculty-student relations (4.27 versus 3.67).

At the end of the term FIPSE students reported a slightly higher average level of comfort and expertise in using computers than non-FIPSE students.

FACULTY SURVEYS AND INTERVIEWS

The evaluation was designed to record faculty attitudes and observations about their own course development and teaching behavior. Since there were only three faculty involved in the first year the three project courses were offered, and another three in the second year, statistical comparisons are not appropriate, nor was the evaluation designed to gather extensive quantitative data from the faculty. Instead, the focus was on obtaining more in-depth qualitative data regarding the faculty's experiences during the project, from which themes could emerge to address issues of importance to faculty development. A summary of this data and emerging themes appears below. For full text of faculty interviews, please see Appendix B.

Highlights from 1993-1994 faculty questionnaires and phone interviews

In the fall, all three faculty indicated that they either were not sure, or had no preference as to whether they would prefer to teach their course in a classroom or on-line. However, in the follow-up interviews, one expressed a strong and one a mild preference for the on-line method.

Although all three expected in the fall that the amount of time they used personal computers, and more specifically the time they used them to communicate with students would change in the spring, those expectations were not met to the degree that they had expected.

Specifically, two indicated that their expectations of both the time and depth of interaction with, and especially comments from students were not met. In one case the faculty member had given an indication in the on-line class as to the number of times students should log into the discussion repeatedly, but without much discernible effect. In the other case the instructor felt that it was up to the students to be adults and take charge of their own on-line learning, and so did not issue such expectations.

One faculty member had anticipated that his course syllabus and student assignments would not change in the on-line class, while the other two were unsure. In fact, all faculty had to make some changes in their on-line class after starting out with the same syllabus. One in particular felt that there was not enough time to cover all of the material, which may have had as much to do with the shorter time frame for the class as with the change in the method of delivery. Another commented that in fact more material was covered, but some of the assignments did not reflect the same depth of understanding as in the fall. However, this may have been due to the particular students who had enrolled in each of the semesters.

Issues of the types of students enrolled in the two semesters surfaced in the interviews. Two faculty noted that there seemed to be much more of a sense of engagement in the fall than the spring, and both felt that was due as much to the students who chose the class as the lack of a physical classroom in which to interact. One raised concerns about letting DIAL students take any courses they pleased, without having the necessary background, in his view, in terms of specific courses or skills.

One faculty member felt that the on-line lectures were more polished than classroom ones, but that that was not necessarily a desirable thing, as spontaneity had given way to order. Similarly, all commented that some of the delayed or lagged interaction from students who did not log on-line as frequently as others made for a somewhat disjointed experience. One noted that when assignments were due, students tended to disappear from the on-line discussion, with much time wasted.

In terms of advice for someone teaching a course on-line in the future, the following were suggested: Take a course on-line yourself before you teach, to know what it's like. Be more firm and structured with students in terms of expectations about on-line contributions (both in terms of quantity and quality). Be flexible enough to change in the course as you go along. And most importantly, make sure the students are steeped in the technology before the course starts to avoid problems caused by technology or computer illiteracy.

Interestingly, in terms of their own computer expertise, the two faculty who had indicated in the fall that they were at a comfort and expertise level of 2 (out of a high of 5) in using computers said in the spring that there was not much of a change. One felt an increase in the comfort level without any increase in expertise. The other admitted to a slight increase in expertise, but not much change in attitude about whether on-line education was anti-intellectual and would change the world of education for the worse. The third faculty member was already at a 5 level in expertise and comfort in the fall with computers.

Overall, these faculty indicated that the on-line course was definitely a positive experience for them, and that they would like to teach on-line again. In fact, one only wants to teach on-line from now on. While they indicated that there were some problems with both the technology and the adaptation of their course to that technology, all felt that with more attention tom the needs of the students in such an environment, the courses could become better on-line as time goes on. One also noted that the on-line experience will be helpful in future teaching in the classroom, by raising his awareness of things that are normally taken for granted in a live interaction.

Highlights from 1994-1995 faculty questionnaires and phone interviews

(Note: There was no questionnaire at the beginning of the term for the faculty teaching the FIPSE courses in 1994-1995, because that instrument for the original three faculty who developed the courses and then taught them by two different methods, had focused on their expectations of the differences in their experience of delivering the course in these two methods. The faculty teaching the courses in 1994-1995 did not have that similar experience of course development and teaching by two methods, and thus only end of term questionnaires were planned for them to discover what their experience teaching on-line had been. These instruments were implemented either as telephone interviews or written questionnaires.)

The experiences of the three faculty teaching the FIPSE project courses on-line in the year after the original faculty taught them, first in a classroom and then on-line, contrast sharply with the experiences of those original faculty. In terms of the overall experience, all three had negative reactions. One felt it was the most frustrating teaching experience of his life, another felt it was a total disaster, and the third believed more time was necessary to have a quality on-line learning experience. All had been teaching only in classroom settings prior to this experience. All were also teaching a course for the first time that they did not personally develop.

The major problems that were mentioned inhibiting a better experience included the small number of students enrolled in the class, some of those students' technical problems in orientation which then dragged on into the course itself, and the apparent lack of interest of some students in engaging in meaningful interaction on-line.

All three mentioned that students had technical problems which resulted in the necessity to adjust the syllabus. None felt that the majority of students logged on enough. One in particular noted that he wished there had been some way to enforce discipline on-line, even if it had to be by threatening a lower grade for not contributing enough to the on-line discussion. He felt there was no way to punish students who suddenly appeared on-line after lurking somewhere for several weeks. However, the same faculty member also believed that the lack of meaningful interaction on-line may have been his fault, because he simply did not know how to stimulate that interaction, something he did know how to do in a classroom.

The on-line experience also led to other negative comments from these faculty. One felt that he was on 24-hour call with the on-line students, which intruded in his life. He much preferred the responsibilities that came with a traditional classroom, where he would spend a specified time teaching, and another fairly predictable amount of time at home reading assignments. The on-line experience was too unpredictable in terms of the time required by the faculty. One felt that there was a socialization problem in that while there is a sense of group responsibility in a classroom setting, no such comparable ethos exists on-line. Specifically, while he went on-line 3 to 4 times a day to check for student interaction, some students did not respond for close to a week.

All three faculty believed that the students did not have sufficient technological know-how as a group to function effectively. In fact, one said he ended up seeing one student in person on a regular basis because the student seemed bright but was not getting enough out of the course. This student was not getting the interaction on-line from other students, and thus the faculty member had to make special arrangements to give him a better learning experience off-line. Two also mentioned that the orientation must be completed early enough to allow for full participation by students immediately. One noted that the DIAL office help-line was understaffed, particularly in the first few weeks of the term, and thus unable to provide the level of support necessary.

Two of the faculty said they would prefer to teach this course in a classroom setting the next time. In fact, one said that he would never teach anything on-line again. He decried the lack of physical face-to-face connection with students, and felt that on-line teaching was a commercialization of the educational experience. The other faculty reiterated the importance of live and spontaneous interaction among students and faculty. One said that while in general he preferred teaching in a classroom, he would like to teach this particular course again on-line to learn more about the process.

In terms of advice for future on-line faculty, recommendations focused mainly on time and student related issues. Two noted the necessity of being prepared to spend much more time in class as well as preparing for class than for a regular classroom experience. One believed that there should be a minimum number of enrollees required to make the class worthwhile. Two felt that a faculty member should establish expectations for logging on immediately, and one wanted to then have some way to enforce those standards. Finally, one noted the need to remain flexible, and another advised to "be careful what you say on-line".

Summary of Faculty Comments

From the above highlights, it is apparent that the two groups of faculty in 1993-1994 and 1994-1995 had rather different experiences. For the most part, the initial faculty cohort, who developed the FIPSE courses and then taught them by two different methods had positive experiences on-line, while the second group teaching the following year had negative experiences. Although there were some negative aspects in the first group's experiences and some positive aspects in the second group, this broad generalization does capture the overall tone of the faculty's reactions.

The reasons for such disparate overall experiences are many. First, the three faculty who taught the courses in 1993-1994 developed the courses themselves, and did so as a group relating to each other in attempting to design a core curriculum for adult students. They were recruited (although one unwillingly) specifically for the project. They spent a great deal of advance time in preparing these courses and thinking about how to adapt them for an on-line delivery. They also had the opportunity to teach the course in two different methods. In contrast, the faculty teaching the courses in 1994-1995 inherited the courses from the initial faculty, with expectations that they leave them generally undisturbed because of the FIPSE project. They also did not have the chance to teach the courses in a classroom first.

While none of the faculty in either year had previously taught on-line, again those in the first year received the benefit of time from participating in the planning stages of the FIPSE project to think about what teaching in a new medium might mean.

The change in the student population taking the three FIPSE courses may also have had an impact on the faculty experiences. In 1993-1994, only New School degree students were allowed to enroll in these courses, since at that time the focus was still on developing an integrated core curriculum. However, in 1994-1995 the courses were opened up to enrollment by any student, whether or not they were New School students and whether or not they were seeking a degree. In fact, a national marketing campaign was carried out successfully by the DIAL staff for all of their on-line courses. As a result, the student populations for these courses were different. In 1993-1994, students enrolled in the FIPSE courses were New School degree candidates, and in general were residents of the metropolitan New York City area. Because of their degree seeking status, they had some identification with and investment in the New School prior to taking these courses. The students in 1994-1995 did not necessarily have such an identification or investment in the institution. In fact, the geographic dispersement of the students was much greater that year, and there were fewer students enrolled interested in earning a degree.

IV. DISCUSSION

The data collected on student attitudes and behaviors in on-line versus classroom courses, as well as the data on faculty attitudes and behaviors in those courses have implications for both the New School and other institutions serving students. These institutions may include colleges and universities serving either traditional or adult students, and may also include other institutions and corporations offering training programs to adults.

Major implications fall under the following categories: student recruitment and services; faculty development; curricular issues; and technological issues. While the data from this relatively small pilot project are not conclusive enough for institutions to make major decisions, it does provide clear indications of several issues that need to be addressed before embarking on or expanding distance education activities. Each of these is discussed in more detail below.

Student recruitment and services

The market for students, whether traditional or adult, has historically simultaneously both expanded and become more competitive. Many higher education institutions, struggling with financial constraints and often with declining pools of prospective students, are seeking innovative methods of recruiting more students, as well as serving more of those students better. Ostensibly, distance education provides benefits on both sides of this issue: it can expand a school's traditional market to a national and even international one, while not requiring a concomitant increase in classroom facilities.

However, prior to beginning or expanding an existing distance learning program, the institution needs to consider important issues in student recruitment and student services. A broad discussion of the mission of the institution and the type(s) of students it wishes to serve should frame any narrower questions of student recruitment and retention services. As the New School has learned, they can effectively broaden their recruitment market to a national one for distance education courses. Any data that an institution could collect to segment their potential market for distance learning programs would be useful in decision-making. Such data should also address whether such a program might simply drain students from existing classroom options. Recruitment methods for different market segments would need to be evaluated on a cost and efficiency basis.

Similarly, any additional or revised student services that would be needed by distance learning students should be addressed up front in terms of costs and availability. The New School data indicate that, at least in the mid-1990s, the likely mix of students in many distance learning classes are likely to include a wide range of technical and computer proficiencies. Support services for these students must be addressed at the beginning of a program. These services include not simply the obvious technical training and ongoing support functions throughout the course which may often be conducted on-line, but also other more traditional services such as registration, course selection counseling, major advising and personal counseling, which often require contact by telephone or in person.

Faculty development

This project has shown that faculty who develop and teach on-line courses cannot be expected to do so well without some training in adapting courses from a traditional classroom to on-line delivery. Although this was a major independent finding by New School administration and faculty, the data from both faculty and students in this evaluation clearly support that conclusion. Asking very experienced faculty, deeply committed to their disciplines and their students, to teach on-line courses does not by itself guarantee a smooth transition to that method. Add to this the likely possibility that faculty may be asked or may want to teach a course on-line before they have ever offered it in a classroom, and the issue becomes more complex.

An institution thus needs to have some method of training faculty to both develop and teach on-line courses. The new FIPSE grant to the New School will allow for the design and testing of a national prototype for adjunct faculty development of such courses. Any institution interested in on-line course development and teaching needs to address such faculty issues for all faculty who may be involved. This would include issues of release time to develop courses, evaluation of faculty in on-line versus traditional classroom environments, as well as faculty recruitment and promotion paths that may differ for those primarily involved in on-line environments. In addition, a broader issue of who should develop courses for on-line delivery should be addressed. For example, an institution may choose to purchase rights to teach on-line courses developed externally, it may designate specific faculty or curricular experts to design such courses for other faculty to teach, or it may desire faculty to develop their own courses.

Curricular issues

In addition to the pedagogical issues raised above under faculty development, there are distinct additional curricular issues raised by the technology of on-line courses. One concerns the time frame for offering on-line courses. In this project, DIAL courses offered on-line were several weeks shorter than the same courses offered in the classroom. Without exception, all faculty commented in their evaluation instruments that the shorter time caused some problems for them in terms of necessitating the removal or lesser coverage of some of the material in the planned syllabus. A number of students commented as well about the difficulty of covering the required material and preparing required papers in such a shortened time frame. Several noted that they felt they did not have enough time to fully understand and integrate the material. When implementing distance learning courses, institutions need to be aware of the impact on both faculty and students of overall timing and sequencing of assignments in in-line courses. This is particularly true when considering on-line instruction for the first time.

This issue of student comprehension in, and preparation for on-line courses is a broader one that also needs some institutional forethought. For example, several of the DIAL faculty commented to evaluators that they wished there had been more prerequisites for their courses, once they realized that students were not as prepared in the subject area as they had assumed. On-line courses should receive the same scrutiny as any other courses, in terms of setting student prerequisites, "attendance" requirements and performance requirements. Some faculty noted that the on-line medium may be more appropriate for certain types of courses - for example for an advanced seminar where all students have comparable background and can be expected to give thoughtful feedback to each other.

The related issues of "attendance" and contribution to on-line courses were repeatedly noted by both faculty and students in evaluation instruments. Faculty in particular noted that their expectations for how often, and in what depth students should be on-line for discussion were not met by the vast majority of the students. They also felt that they did not have tools available to threaten or to reward students for such participation, whereas in a traditional classroom setting they felt much more in control of the class. Some students also noted the absence and sometimes the superficiality of comments by others in their on-line classes, which they believed detracted from their own experience. Attention to such administrative issues by faculty and institutional reward and punishment systems for on-line students need be discussed prior to on-line instruction.

Finally, the sequencing of course materials, assignments, and on-line discussion presents another issue for faculty to deal with when managing the on-line courses. Some faculty raised issues of whether it is possible for the syllabus to remain intact in its sequence when students do not keep up with the assigned material or with others' comments. Several noted that during the weeks when assignments were due, little student on-line interaction occurred, whereas in a classroom setting the majority of students would still have come to class and some interaction could have been precipitated. Again, this issue is related to the overall management of on-line courses, and an institution needs to consider the impact on on-line course performance.

Technological issues

Finally, while technological issues are normally the ones explicitly addressed by institutions considering implementing or expanding on-line course delivery, this project found that the extent of those issues are likely to be underestimated. In general, these issues deal with technical needs to handle the actual course delivery, with faculty training to use that technology, and with student use of the technology they need to gain access from a remote site to the course.

In each of these three areas, this project indicated that advanced planning, and particularly the flexibility to change administrative procedures in the event of technical problems are critical to the success of distance learning instruction. In planning for the technical needs at the New School, the administration and DIAL staff anticipated the need for a new software system as early as the second year of the project, and began to change over to that system over the summer. Technical delays for getting the courses on-line still arose, and in addition technical problems prevented this evaluation from being conducted entirely on-line. Fortunately the dedicated DIAL staff was able to overcome such problems. While it can be anticipated that with time institutions will become more competent in dealing with new and better technology, the reality for the immediate future is that extensive technical expertise will be necessary to support on-line course delivery.

In addition to the administrative and technical support necessary to get the course materials on-line, the remaining two issues of faculty and student training and support need to be anticipated. Neither faculty nor students can be expected to make the most efficient use of the new technology without training and extensive support. For students in particular, who may physically be located around the country or the world, ongoing access to technical support services may be critical to successful course participation. Planning such training and support into the programs is often anticipated, but without a real sense of the nature and extent of such support.

V. DISSEMINATION PLAN

Implicit in a pilot project such as this is the expectation that findings and experiences be shared with other higher education institutions and other sectors of the public, particularly those with an interest in distance learning or adult training and education. The evaluation portion of this project can make contributions in three possible areas for those desiring to make decisions about distance learning programs: sharing of the instruments developed during the project; sharing of the data collected; and sharing of implications for administrators, faculty, and prospective and current students.

While this final report includes these three aspects of our findings, the evaluation team cannot assume that those most in need of these data and information will be aware of this project and of the existence of the report. Thus, we propose a three-pronged approach to disseminating this information.

First, New School administration organized a Symposium at the New School in November, 1995 at which issues of distance learning were discussed. One of the presentations was by this evaluation team on preliminary findings of this project, and the need to include evaluation in planning any distance education course offerings.

Second, FIPSE has recently funded a three-year project for an adjunct faculty training program to develop competencies in developing and teaching on-line courses. The program, initially offered to New School faculty, will include national faculty participation in its final year. The data from this final report should be made available to all the faculty participating in this project, as well as to the administrators at their institutions.

Finally, dissemination of research findings from this project at various national conferences focusing on distance education, adult education, and higher education have begun and will continue over the next few years. A member of the DIAL staff presented a paper on "Teaching in two environments: A case study comparing face-to-face and on-line instruction" at the Distance Education Research Conference at the Pennsylvania State University in May, 1995. An evaluation team member will be presenting a paper at the Association for Institutional Research National Forum to in May, 1996 on "Segmenting the distance learning market: An analysis of student preferences for and learning goals in on-line courses." Additional papers and conference presentations will be proposed once appropriate venues for dissemination of findings are identified.

REFERENCES

Administrators' Views on Changes in Learning Opportunities. (1995, September 1). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 32.

Astin, A.W. (1991). Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Harrison, P.J., et al. (1991). Development of a Distance Education Assessment Instrument. Educational Technology Research and Development, 39 (4), 65-77.

Kendall, J.R. & Oaks, M. (1992). Evaluation of Perceived Teaching Effectiveness: Course Delivery via Interactive Video Technology versus Traditional Classroom Methods. DEOSNEWS, The Distance Education Online Symposium, 2 (4).

Rumble, G. (1986). The Planning and Management of Distance Education. London: Croom Helm.

Thorpe, M. (1988). Evaluating Open and Distance Learning. London: Longman.

Verduin, J.R. & Clark, T.A. (1991). Distance Education: The Foundations of Effective Practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. (1987). Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. New York: Longman.

APPENDICES

A. INSTRUMENTS DEVELOPED
B. DETAILED DATA COLLECTED

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
THE NEW SCHOOL
66 WEST 12TH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10011
(212) 229-5613

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Beginning of the Term Questionnaire

The New School has received a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, an agency of the U.S. Department of Education, to plan and implement three new courses, and to use innovative approaches in delivering the courses to our students.

You have registered for one of these courses and we need your help in assessing its quality, value and effectiveness. The purpose of this questionnaire is to ascertain the goals, purposes and expectations you have of the course before it begins. We will administer a second questionnaire at the conclusion of the course.

I would be grateful if you would take a few minutes to respond to the following questions.

It is important that you answer each question in a straightforward and honest way. Your responses will be held in the strictest professional confidence, and all results will be presented in group form only. NO STUDENT WILL BE INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIED IN REPORTING THE RESULTS. Your responses to these questions will not in any way alter the plans, content and structure of the course.

We appreciate your cooperation in completing the questionnaire.

THANK YOU!

Elizabeth Dickey

Elizabeth Dickey
Dean
The New School

1. WHY DID YOU DECIDE TO ENROLL IN THIS COURSE? (Check **all** that apply.)

   A. ☐ I need this course to help fulfill requirements for a Baccalaureate degree
   B. ☐ I need this course to help fulfill requirements for a Master's degree
   C. ☐ I am taking this course out of interest in the subject
   D. ☐ The timing of the course is convenient
   E. ☐ I wanted to take a course from this faculty member
   F. ☐ Other ______________________________

   Of the above, which was the most important reason?

   (Enter **one** letter only.) ______

2. APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY COLLEGE-LEVEL COURSES HAVE YOU TAKEN IN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES?

   ____________________ courses

3. WHAT OTHER COURSES, IF ANY, ARE YOU TAKING AT THE NEW SCHOOL THIS TERM?

Department	Course Name
________	________________________________
________	________________________________
________	________________________________
________	________________________________
________	________________________________

4. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EXPECTATIONS OF HOW OFTEN YOU PLAN TO DO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING DURING THIS COURSE. (Circle only **one** on each line.)

	Daily	Weekly	Every other week	Monthly	At most once during term
Use a computer to help complete assignments	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in social activities on campus with other students	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in social activities off campus with other students	1	2	3	4	5
Discuss your career plans and ambitions with a New School advisor	1	2	3	4	5
Attend art, music or drama productions on campus	1	2	3	4	5
Study for this course with other students taking it	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in some art, drama, or music activity on campus	1	2	3	4	5
Communicate with other students from the New School via computer	1	2	3	4	5

5. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR GOALS FOR WHAT YOU PLAN TO GET OUT OF THIS COURSE INTELLECTUALLY:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR GOALS FOR WHAT YOU PLAN TO GET OUT OF THIS COURSE SOCIALLY:

7. ARE YOU AWARE THAT THIS COURSE IS ALSO OFFERED THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION USING TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES IN YOUR HOME OR OFFICE IN THE SPRING TERM? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. WOULD YOU PREFER TO TAKE THIS COURSE IN A TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM SETTING OR THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION USING TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES IN YOUR HOME OR OFFICE? (Check **one** only.)

☐ In a classroom ☐ At home/office

☐ No preference ☐ Not sure

Please elaborate

9. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE EQUIPMENT YOU HAVE ACCESS TO AT HOME AND/OR AT WORK FOR USE IN CARRYING OUT YOUR COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AT THE NEW SCHOOL. (Check **all** that apply)

PERSONAL COMPUTER

HOME **WORK**

☐ ☐ Apple/Macintosh

☐ ☐ IBM

☐ ☐ IBM-Compatible: Specify manufacturer:________________________

☐ ☐ Other: Specify: ____

COMPUTER MONITOR

HOME **WORK**

☐ ☐ Monochrome

☐ ☐ Color

DISK DRIVES

HOME **WORK**

☐ ☐ Floppy disk drive(s): Number: ________

Size if known: __________K or __________M

☐ ☐ Hard disk drive: Size if known: _________M

PRINTER

HOME WORK

☐ ☐ Dot matrix

☐ ☐ Ink jet

☐ ☐ Laser

☐ ☐ Other: Specify: ______________________

OTHER COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

HOME WORK

☐ ☐ Modem: Speed if known: ______________

☐ ☐ Plotter

☐ ☐ Scanner

Other: Please specify:

☐ ☐ ______________________________

☐ ☐ ______________________________

☐ ☐ ______________________________

☐ ☐ ______________________________

OTHER EQUIPMENT

HOME **WORK**

☐ ☐ VCR

☐ ☐ CD Player

☐ ☐ FAX Machine

☐ ☐ Audio Cassette Player

Other: Please specify:

☐ ☐ ____________________________________

☐ ☐ ____________________________________

COMPUTER SOFTWARE

HOME **WORK**

☐ ☐ Word processing program(s): Program name(s)__________________

☐ ☐ Spreadsheet program(s): Program name(s)______________________

☐ ☐ Database/file management program(s): Program name(s)___________

☐ ☐ Communications language(s):________________________________

Other: Please specify type(s) or name of program(s):

☐ ☐ ____________________________________

☐ ☐ ____________________________________

10. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS? _________ years

11. HAVE YOU EVER PARTICIPATED IN COMPUTER TELECONFERENCING? (Chech **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

12. HAVE YOU EVER USED ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL)? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

13. HAVE YOU EVER USED A PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE ON A PERSONAL COMPUTER? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. PLEASE RATE YOUR LEVEL OF EXPERTISE IN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS. (Circle **one** number only on the scale below.)

1 Low	2	3	4	5 High

15. PLEASE RATE YOUR LEVEL OF COMFORT IN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS. (Circle **one** number only on the scale below.)

1 Low	2	3	4	5 High

16. **APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENT OF YOUR TOTAL EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES (including Tuition, Living Expenses, Books and supplies, etc.) ARE COVERED BY EACH OF THE SOURCES LISTED BELOW? (Circle only one on each line)**

	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Self	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
Parents/Other Relatives	1	2	3	4	5
Government Grants (Pell, SEOG)	1	2	3	4	5
New School Grants	1	2	3	4	5
Loans	1	2	3	4	5
Employer	1	2	3	4	5
Other ____________________	1	2	3	4	5

17. IF EMPLOYED MORE THAN HALF-TIME, WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?

____

18. WHILE TAKING THIS COURSE, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU PLAN TO SPEND WORKING ON A JOB? (Check **one** only.)

☐ None (or only occasional jobs)
☐ 1 - 9 hours
☐ 10 - 19 hours
☐ 20 - 29 hours
☐ 30 - 39 hours
☐ 40 hours or more

19. IF YOU WORK, WHAT ARE YOUR TYPICAL WORKING HOURS?

____

20. IF YOU WORK, IS YOUR JOB IN MANHATTAN?

☐ Yes ☐ No

21. IF YOU HAVE A SPOUSE OR PARTNER, WHAT IS HIS OR HER OCCUPATION?

____

22. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING INCOME RANGES BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Under $25,000
☐ $25,000 to $34,999
☐ $35,000 to $49,999
☐ $50,000 to $74,999
☐ $75,000 to $99,999
☐ Greater than $100,000

23. WHICH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING AGE GROUPINGS DO YOU BELONG TO? (Check **one** only.)

☐ 18-21
☐ 22-24
☐ 25-29
☐ 30-34
☐ 35-39
☐ 40-44
☐ 45-49
☐ 50-54
☐ 55-59
☐ over 60

24. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ETHNICITY? (Check **one** only.)

☐ African-American/Black
☐ Asian-American/Asian
☐ Native American
☐ White
☐ Latino/Hispanic
☐ Other ________________

25. ARE YOU: (Check **one** only.)

☐ Single
☐ Living with a partner
☐ Married
☐ Separated or divorced
☐ Widowed

26. INDICATE THE TERM AND YEAR IN WHICH YOU FIRST ENROLLED AT THE NEW SCHOOL:

19____ FALL________

SPRING______

SUMMER_____

27. INDICATE HOW MANY CREDIT HOURS YOU HAVE EARNED AT THE NEW SCHOOL. (Do not include credit hours transferred from another institution.)

____

28. IF YOU HAVE TRANSFERRED CREDITS FROM ONE OR MORE INSTITUTIONS TO THE NEW SCHOOL, PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF CREDITS:

____

29. IF YOU TRANSFERRED CREDITS FROM ONE OR MORE INSTITUTIONS, PLEASE INDICATE THE LAST INSTITUTION YOU ATTENDED PRIOR TO ENROLLING AT THE NEW SCHOOL:

INSTITUTION:____________________________LOCATION:____________________

30. WHERE IS YOUR PRIMARY RESIDENCE WHILE TAKING THIS COURSE AT THE NEW SCHOOL? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Greenwich Village
☐ Other Manhattan location
☐ Brookyn, Bronx, Queens, or Staten Island
☐ Long Island
☐ Other New York State
☐ New Jersey
☐ Connecticut
☐ Other:________________________________

31. ARE YOU PRESENTLY ENROLLED AS: (Check **one** only.)

☐ Full-time student
☐ Part-time student

32. INTO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GENERAL CATEGORIES DOES YOUR MAIN INTEREST FALL? (Check only **one** - the one you most identify with.)

☐ Humanities
☐ Sciences
☐ Business
☐ Communications
☐ Education
☐ Health Related Fields
☐ Social Sciences
☐ Other, please specify:

____

33. WHAT IS YOUR SEX?

☐ Female ☐ Male

34. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE YOU PLAN TO OBTAIN? (Check one only.)

☐ None
☐ Associate's degree
☐ Bachelor's degree
☐ Master's degree
☐ Doctorate
☐ Professional degree (MD, JD, etc.)

35. YOUR ID NUMBER________________________

NOTE: We need your ID number in order to match your responses with those in the questionnaire we will administer at the end of the course. Your instructor will not have access to these questionnaires, and only summary reports will be issued. No student will be individually identified.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Course Evaluation Questionnaire

The New School has received a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, an agency of the U.S. Department of Education, to plan and implement some innovative courses and to use innovative approaches to deliver these courses to students. The course you have just completed is one of three new courses offered this year, and we need your help in assessing its quality, value and effectiveness. Your responses to the questions in this questionnaire will help us to evaluate the course that you have taken and help us to improve the course for the future.

It is important that you answer each question in a straightforward and honest way. Your responses will be held in the strictest professional confidence, and all results will be presented in group form only. NO STUDENT WILL BE INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIED. We need to receive input from as many students as possible, and your responses are crucial.

We appreciate your cooperation in completing the questionnaire and will provide you with a report of the findings from the analyses of the questionnaire results on request.

THANK YOU!

Elizabeth Dickey
Dean, New School for Social Research

1. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS. (Circle **one** number on each line.)

	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I feel that I have had access to all the materials I needed to succeed in this course	1	2	3	4	5
This course has been difficult for me	1	2	3	4	5
I have had sufficient one on one communication with the professor in this course	1	2	3	4	5
It is important for me to graduate with a degree from the New School	1	2	3	4	5
The professor in this course has been an effective communicator	1	2	3	4	5
I found this course to be intellectually stimulating	1	2	3	4	5
My professor appears to be attuned to my interests, needs and aspirations as a student	1	2	3	4	5
There has been a strong sense of community: a feeling of shared interests and purpose among the students taking this course	1	2	3	4	5
The professor in this course has had a strong impact on my intellectual development	1	2	3	4	5
If I were taking this course again, I would prefer to take this course off campus via telecommunications or correspondence rather than on campus	1	2	3	4	5
It has been difficult for me to communicate with other students taking this course	1	2	3	4	5
I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to take this course	1	2	3	4	5
I took this course mainly out of interest in the subject and not necessarily because of my interest in pursuing a degree	1	2	3	4	5
I took this course because of my attraction to technology and use of computers	1	2	3	4	5
This course has made me more interested in technology and use of computers	1	2	3	4	5
It is important for me to get a high grade in this course	1	2	3	4	5
The faculty member for this course is a good teacher	1	2	3	4	5
I feel that I met the intellectual goals I had for this course	1	2	3	4	5
It has been easy for me to develop a good working relationship with the faculty member teaching this course	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with my intellectual development since enrolling in this course	1	2	3	4	5
This course would be of equal quality regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus	1	2	3	4	5
This course would be of equal value to me regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus	1	2	3	4	5
I would prefer to take this course on campus with faculty members present rather than off campus via telecommunications	1	2	3	4	5

2. **HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SINCE ENROLLING IN THIS COURSE? (Circle one number on each line.)**

At most once during term
Monthly
Every other week
Weekly
Daily

Used a computer to help complete assignments	1	2	3	4	5
Participated in social activities on campus with other students	1	2	3	4	5
Participated in social activities off campus with other students	1	2	3	4	5
Discussed your career plans and ambitions with an advisor	1	2	3	4	5
Attended art, music or drama productions on campus	1	2	3	4	5
Studied for this course with other students who are taking it	1	2	3	4	5
Participated in some art, drama, or music activity on campus	1	2	3	4	5
Communicated with other New School students via computer	1	2	3	4	5

3. FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, HOW OFTEN **IN THIS COURSE** DID YOU THINK OR ACT IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED? (Circle **one** number on each line.)

Rarely
Once in a while
Sometimes
Frequently
Almost always

I saw to it that my schoolwork was carefully planned and organized	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever I had difficulty with an assignment, I talked it over with my professor	1	2	3	4	5
I worked as hard as I could in the course	1	2	3	4	5
I kept my assignments up to date	1	2	3	4	5
I seemed to accomplish all that could be expected by the professor	1	2	3	4	5
Problems outside of school caused me to neglect my schoolwork	1	2	3	4	5

4. WHILE TAKING THIS COURSE, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY HOURS DID YOU SPEND IN A TYPICAL WEEK WORKING AS A PAID EMPLOYEE AT A JOB?______________hours per week

5. HOW SATISFIED HAVE YOU BEEN WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE? (Circle **one** number on each line.)

	Very unsatisfied				Very Satisfied
Communications with your professor	1	2	3	4	5
Method of course delivery	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of instruction	1	2	3	4	5
Faculty-student relations	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of course materials	1	2	3	4	5
Your intellectual development	1	2	3	4	5
Student relations with each other	1	2	3	4	5
Access to library resources	1	2	3	4	5
Access to technological/computer resources	1	2	3	4	5

6. PLEASE COMMENT ON ANY ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WHICH YOU FOUND PARTICULARLY SATISFYING.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

7. PLEASE COMMENT ON ANY ASPECTS OF THIS COURSE WHICH YOU FOUND PARTICULARLY UNSATISFYING.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

8. PLEASE RATE YOUR LEVEL OF EXPERTISE IN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS. **(Circle one number only on the scale below.)**

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

9. PLEASE RATE YOUR LEVEL OF COMFORT IN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS. **(Circle one number only on the scale below.)**

1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

10. HOW MANY OTHER COURSES, IF ANY, ARE YOU TAKING AT THE NEW SCHOOL THIS TERM?

______________ courses

11. ARE YOU AWARE THAT THIS COURSE WAS ALSO OFFERED IN A TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM SETTING IN THE FALL TERM? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

12. WOULD YOU PREFER TO TAKE THIS COURSE IN A TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM SETTING OR THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION USING TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES IN YOUR HOME OR OFFICE? (Check **one** only.)

☐ In a classroom ☐ At home/office

☐ No preference ☐ Not sure

Please elaborate ____

____

____

____

____

13. DID YOU PURCHASE A COMPUTER THROUGH THE NEW SCHOOL IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS COURSE? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN USING PERSONAL COMPUTERS? _________ years

15. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING INCOME RANGES BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Under $25,000

☐ $25,000 to $34,999

☐ $35,000 to $49,999

☐ $50,000 to $74,999

☐ $75,000 to $99,999

☐ Greater than $100,000

16. WHICH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING AGE GROUPINGS DO YOU BELONG TO? (Check **one** only.)

- ☐ 18-21
- ☐ 22-24
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ over 60

17. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ETHNICITY? (Check **one** only.)

- ☐ African-American/Black
- ☐ Asian-American/Asian
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ White
- ☐ Latino/Hispanic
- ☐ Other ________________

18. ARE YOU: (Check **one** only.)

- ☐ Single
- ☐ Living with a partner
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Separated or divorced
- ☐ Widowed

19. INDICATE THE TERM AND YEAR IN WHICH YOU **FIRST** ENROLLED AT THE NEW SCHOOL:

19____ FALL________

SPRING_____

SUMMER_____

20. INDICATE APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY CREDIT HOURS YOU HAVE EARNED AT THE NEW SCHOOL. (Do not include credit hours transferred from another institution.)

____

21. ARE YOU PURSUING A DEGREE AT THE NEW SCHOOL? (Check **one** only.)

☐Yes ☐ No

22. WHERE IS YOUR PRIMARY RESIDENCE WHILE TAKING THIS COURSE AT THE NEW SCHOOL? (Check **one** only.)

☐ Greenwich Village
☐ Other Manhattan location
☐ Brooklyn, Bronx, Queens, or Staten Island
☐ Long Island
☐ Other New York State
☐ New Jersey
☐ Connecticut
☐ Other:_______________________________

23. ARE YOU PRESENTLY ENROLLED AS: (Check **one** only.)

☐ Full-time student
☐ Part-time student

24. INTO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GENERAL CATEGORIES DOES YOUR MAIN INTEREST FALL? (Check only **one** - the one you most identify with.)

☐ Humanities
☐ Sciences
☐ Business
☐ Communications
☐ Education
☐ Health Related Fields
☐ Social Sciences
☐ Other, please specify:

____

25. WHAT IS YOUR SEX?

☐ Female ☐ Male

26. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE YOU PLAN TO OBTAIN? (Check **one** only.)

- ☐ None
- ☐ Associate's degree
- ☐ Bachelor's degree
- ☐ Master's degree
- ☐ Doctorate
- ☐ Professional degree (MD, JD, etc.)

27. YOUR ID NUMBER:

____

NOTE: We need your ID number in order to match your responses with those in the questionnaire we administered at the beginning of the course. Your instructor will not have access to these questionnaires, and only summary reports will be issued. No student will be individually identified.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

NEW SCHOOL DIAL FACULTY END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR NAME:______________________________________

1a. After having taught courses in both the traditional classroom setting and through distance education, which do you like better?

______ The classroom ______ The distance education method

______ Both equally ______ No preference

1b. Why?____

____

____

____

____

2a. If you had to teach **this course** again, how would you prefer to teach it?

______ In the classroom ______ Through distance education

______ No preference for either method

2b. Why?____

____

____

____

____

____

3. Please rate your level of **expertise** in using personal computers.

1 2 3 4 5
Low High

4. Please rate your level of **comfort** in using personal computers.

1 2 3 4 5
Low High

5a. In the DIAL course you taught this fall term, how often did you **expect** your students to come on-line for the class?

____

5b. Did the majority of your students meet this expectation?

______ Yes ______ No

5c. Any comments, either about the number of times students were on-line, or the length or depth of commentary by students on-line?

____

____

____

____

____

____

5d. How often did you yourself **expect** to connect on-line for the class before it started?

____

5e. How often did you actually connect on-line for the class?

____

5f. Any comments about your own experiences on-line for this class?

6. What were the differences, if any, that you noticed in your students in the on-line course from students in a traditional classroom setting?

7. Did you see or speak to any of the students in the DIAL course outside of class?

______ Yes ______ No

8a. During the term, did you find that you had to make adjustments in your course plan as the course progressed, because of the on-line nature of the course?

______ Yes ______ No

8b. If yes, what kind of adjustments, and why?

9. If you were to give **three** pieces of advice to a faculty member teaching on-line next term, what would they be?

10. Any other comments on any aspect of your experiences with the DIAL course are welcome.

____

____

____

____

____

____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

APPENDIX B: DATA

Questionnaire Summary 1993-1994

NOTE: All data for 1993-1994 are from the three FIPSE project courses. The fall term 1993 courses were taught in a classroom by the original project faculty. In the spring term 1994, the same faculty each taught the same course on-line. Fall term respondents total 36, and spring term respondents total 19. These represent approximately 95% of fall term and 65% of spring term enrollees in the project courses.

Beginning of Term Questionnaire Fall 1993 and Spring 1994

Why did you decide to enroll in this course? Which was the most important reason?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
To help fulfill requirements for a baccalaureate degree	4	11.1	4	21.1
To help fulfill requirements for a Master's degree	0		0	
Out of interest in the subject	25	69.4	9	47.4
Timing is convenient	1	2.8	0	
Wanted to take course from this faculty member	3	8.3	3	15.8
Other (tuition discount)	3	8.3	3	15.8

Please describe your expectations of how often you plan to do each of the following during this course. (Code=1="Daily" 2="Weekly" 3=Every other week" 4="Monthly" 5="At most once during term".)

Use a computer to help complete assignments.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	3	8.3	9	47.4
Weekly	15	41.7	7	36.8
Every other week	5	13.9	0	
Monthly	9	25.0	1	5.3
Once during term	4	11.1	0	
No answer			2	10.5
		Mean 2.89	Mean 1.59	

Participate in social activities on campus with other students.

	FALL Frequency	FALL Percent	SPRING Frequency	SPRING Percent
Weekly	1	2.8	3	15.8
Every other week	5	13.9	0	
Monthly	8	22.2	2	10.5
Once during term	20	55.6	10	52.6
No answer	2	5.6	4	21.1

Mean: 4.38

Mean: 4.27

Participate in social activities off campus with other students.

	FALL Frequency	FALL Percent	SPRING Frequency	SPRING Percent
Daily	1	2.8	0	
Weekly	1	2.8	0	
Every other week	3	8.3	2	10.5
Monthly	5	13.9	3	15.8
Once during term	22	61.1	10	52.6
No answer	4	11.1	4	21.1

Mean: 4.44

Mean: 4.53

Discuss your career plans and ambitions with an advisor.

	FALL Frequency	FALL Percent	SPRING Frequency	SPRING Percent
Weekly	1	2.8	0	
Monthly	9	25.0	3	15.8
Once during term	26	72.2	12	63.2
No answer	0		4	21.1

Mean: 4.67

Mean: 4.80

Attend art, music or drama productions on campus.

	FALL Frequency	FALL Percent	SPRING Frequency	SPRING Percent
Weekly	0		1	5.3
Every other week	3	8.3	1	5.3
Monthly	17	47.2	4	21.1
Once during term	15	41.7	9	47.4
No answer	1	2.8	4	21.1

Mean: 4.34

Mean: 4.40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Study for this course with other students taking it.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	3	8.3	1	5.3
Monthly	7	19.4	0	
Once during term	23	63.9	13	68.4
No answer	3	8.3	5	26.3
	Mean: 4.61		Mean: 4.86	

Participate in some art, drama, or music activity on campus.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	1	2.8	1	5.3
Every other week	1	2.8	0	
Monthly	2	5.6	1	5.3
Once during term	28	77.8	13	68.4
No answer	4	11.1	4	21.1
	Mean: 4.78		Mean: 4.73	

Communicate with other New School students via computer.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	0		4	21.1
Weekly	0		9	47.4
Every other week	1	2.8	2	10.5
Once during term	28	77.8	1	5.3
No answer	7	19.4	3	15.8
	Mean: 4.93		Mean: 2.06	

(Fall term only) Are you aware that this course is also offered through distance education using telecommunications and computer technologies in your home or office in the spring term?

All 36 students answered "Yes"

(Spring term only) Are you aware that this course was also offered in a traditional classroom setting in the fall term?

	Frequency	Percent
No	5	26.3
Yes	12	63.2
No answer	2	10.5

Into which of the following general categories does your main interest fall?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Humanities	14	38.9	10	52.6
Communications	5	13.9	0	
Education	2	5.6	1	5.3
Health related fields	1	2.8	1	5.3
Social sciences	8	22.2	5	26.3
Other	3	8.3	1	5.3
No answer	3	8.3	1	5.3

What is your sex?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Female	17	47.2	13	68.4
Male	18	50.0	6	31.6
No answer	1	2.8	0	

What is the highest academic degree you plan to obtain?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None	0		2	10.5
Bachelor's degree	6	16.7	1	5.3
Master's degree	17	47.2	11	57.9
Doctorate	6	16.7	2	10.5
Professional degree	4	11.1	3	15.8
No answer	3	8.3	0	

Would you prefer to take this course in a traditional classroom setting or through distance education using telecommunications and computer technologies in your home or office?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
In a classroom	19	52.8	1	5.3
At home/office	5	13.9	9	47.4
No preference	0		1	.3
Not sure	12	33.3	6	31.6
No answer	0		2	10.5

How long have you been using personal computers?

FALL

Mean: 5.88 years Standard deviation: 3.97 years

Range from 0 to 13 years.

SPRING

Mean: 3.37 years Standard deviation: 3.22 years

Range from 0 to 12 years.

Please rate your level of expertise in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FALL

Mean: 2.74 Standard deviation: 1.12

SPRING

Mean: 3.00 Standard deviation: 1.41

Please rate your level of comfort in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FALL

Mean: 3.53 Standard deviation: 1.28

SPRING

Mean: 3.59 Standard deviation: 1.54

While taking this course, approximately how many hours a week do you plan to spend working on a job?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None	8	22.2	1	5.3
10-19 hours	3	8.3	1	5.3
20-29 hours	3	8.3	2	10.5
30-39 hours	6	16.7	3	15.8
40+ hours	14	38.9	10	52.6
No answer	2	5.6	2	10.5

Which of the following income ranges best describes your annual household income?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Under $25,000	13	36.1	3	15.8
$25,000-$34,999	4	11.1	2	10.5
$35,000-$49,999	4	11.1	4	21.1
$50,000-$74,999	6	16.7	3	15.8
$75,000-$99,999	5	13.9	3	15.8
$100,000+	1	2.8	4	21.1
No answer	3	8.3	0	

Which of the following age groupings do you belong to?

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
18-21	4	11.1	0	
22-24	9	25.0	3	15.8
25-29	5	13.9	5	26.3
30-34	6	16.7	2	10.5
35-39	3	8.3	1	5.3
40-44	5	13.9	3	15.8
45-49	2	5.6	2	10.5
50-54	0		3	15.8
55-59	1	2.8	0	
Over 60	0		0	
No answer	1	2.8	0	

Which of the following groups best describes your ethnicity?

	FALL		SPRING	
Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	
African-American/Black	3	8.3	0	
Asian-American/Asian	1	2.8	2	10.5
Native American	0		0	
White	26	72.2	16	84.2
Latino/Hispanic	1	2.8	0	
Other	4	11.1	1	5.3
No answer	1	2.8	0	

Are you presently enrolled as

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Full-time student	11	30.6	5	26.3
Part-time student	24	66.7	13	68.4
No answer	1	2.8	1	5.3

End of Term Course Evaluation Fall 1993 and Spring 1994

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (Code: 1="Strongly agree" 2="Agree" 3=Neither agree or disagree" 4="Disagree" 5="Strongly disagree".)

I feel that I have had access to all the materials I need to succeed in this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	15	41.7	3	15.8
Agree	11	30.6	8	42.1
Neutral	4	11.1	1	5.3
Disagree	1	2.8	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.71		Mean: 1.83	

This course has been difficult for me.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	8.3	1	5.3
Agree	5	13.9	3	15.8
Neutral	8	22.2	7	36.8
Disagree	8	22.2	1	5.3
Strongly disagree	5	13.9	0	
No answer	7	19.4	7	36.8
	Mean: 3.24		Mean: 2.67	

I have had sufficient one on one communication with the professor in this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	13	36.1	3	15.8
Agree	13	36.1	5	26.3
Neutral	4	11.1	2	10.5
Disagree	1	2.8	2	10.5
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.77		Mean: 2.25	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is important for me to graduate with a degree from the New School.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	17	47.2	5	26.3
Agree	10	27.8	3	15.8
Neutral	3	8.3	1	5.3
Strongly disagree	1	2.8	2	10.5
No answer	5	13.9	8	42.1
	Mean: 1.65		Mean: 2.18	

The professor in this course has been an effective communicator.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	17	47.2	7	36.8
Agree	10	27.8	3	15.8
Neutral	1	2.8	1	5.3
Disagree	2	5.6	1	5.3
Strongly disagree	1	2.8	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.71		Mean: 1.67	

I found this course to be intellectually stimulating.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	52.8	9	47.4
Agree	9	25.0	2	10.5
Neutral	3	8.3	0	
Disagree	0		1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean 1.48		Mean 1.42	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My professor appears to be sensitive to my interests, needs and aspirations as a student.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	14	38.9	8	42.1
Agree	10	27.8	2	10.5
Neutral	4	11.1	1	5.3
Disagree	3	8.3	1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean: 1.87

Mean: 1.58

There is a strong sense of community, a feeling of shared interests and purpose among the students taking this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	7	19.4	4	21.1
Agree	11	30.6	4	21.1
Neutral	7	19.4	2	10.5
Disagree	3	8.3	0	
Strongly disagree	3	8.3	2	10.5
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean: 2.48

Mean: 2.33

The professor in this course has had a strong impact on my intellectual development.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	9	25.0	6	31.6
Agree	10	27.8	4	21.1
Neutral	7	19.4	0	
Disagree	3	8.3	2	10.5
Strongly disagree	2	5.6	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean 2.32

Mean 1.83

If I were taking this course again, I would prefer to take this course off campus via telecommunications or correspondence rather than on campus.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	8.3	3	15.8
Agree	3	8.3	2	10.5
Neutral	5	13.9	4	21.1
Disagree	8	22.2	2	10.5
Strongly disagree	12	33.3	1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean: 3.74 Mean: 2.67

It has been difficult for me to communicate with other students taking this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	5	13.9	1	5.3
Agree	1	2.8	4	21.1
Neutral	4	11.1	2	10.5
Disagree	12	33.3	2	10.5
Strongly disagree	9	25.0	3	15.8
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean: 3.61 Mean: 3.17

I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to take this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	16	44.4	10	52.6
Agree	12	33.3	2	10.5
Neutral	1	2.8	0	
Disagree	2	5.6	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8

Mean: 1.65 Mean: 1.17

I took this course mainly out of interest in the subject and not necessarily because of my interest in pursuing a degree.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	11	30.6	4	21.1
Agree	10	27.8	0	
Neutral	7	19.4	6	31.6
Disagree	3	8.3	2	10.5
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 2.06		Mean: 2.50	

It is important for me to get a high grade in this course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	15	41.7	1	5.3
Agree	9	29.0	5	26.3
Neutral	6	16.7	3	15.8
Strongly disagree	1	2.8	3	15.8
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.81		Mean: 2.92	

The faculty member for this course is a good teacher.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	18	50.0	1	5.3
Agree	7	19.4	8	42.1
Neutral	3	8.3	2	10.5
Disagree	3	8.3	0	
Strongly disagree	0		1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.71		Mean: 2.33	

This course would be of equal *quality* regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	5.6	5	26.3
Agree	2	5.6	2	10.5
Neutral	9	25.0	3	15.8
Disagree	10	27.8	2	10.5
Strongly disagree	7	19.4	0	
No answer	6	16.7	7	36.8
	Mean: 3.60		Mean: 2.17	

This course would be of equal *value* to me regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	8.3	4	21.1
Agree	7	19.4	6	31.6
Neutral	12	33.3	2	10.5
Disagree	4	11.1	0	
Strongly disagree	5	13.9	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 3.03		Mean: 1.83	

I would prefer to take this course on campus with faculty members present rather than off campus via telecommunications.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	15	41.7	1	5.3
Agree	9	25.0	4	21.1
Neutral	3	8.3	4	21.1
Disagree	3	8.3	2	10.5
Strongly disagree	1	2.8	1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.90		Mean: 2.83	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How often have you done each of the following since enrolling in this course? (Code: 1="Daily" 2="Weekly" 3="Every other week" 4="Monthly" 5="At most once during term".)

Used a computer to help complete assignments.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	1	2.8	9	47.4
Weekly	7	19.4	3	15.8
Every other week	6	16.7	0	
Monthly	11	30.6	0	
Once during term	6	16.7	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 3.45		Mean: 1.25	

Participated in social activities on campus with other students.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	1	2.8	0	
Every other week	2	5.6	0	
Monthly	0		1	5.3
Once during term	26	72.2	8	42.1
No answer	7	19.4	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.76		Mean: 4.89	

Participated in social activities off campus with other students.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	2	5.6	0	
Every other week	2	5.6	1	5.3
Monthly	5	13.9	0	
Once during term	20	55.6	8	42.1
No answer	7	19.4	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.48		Mean: 4.79	

Discussed your career plans and ambitions with an advisor.

	FALL		**SPRING**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	1	2.8	0	
Monthly	3	8.3	1	5.3
Once during term	26	72.2	8	42.1
No answer	6	16.7	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.83		Mean: 4.89	

Attended art, music or drama productions on campus.

	FALL		**SPRING**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	6	16.7	1	5.3
Once during term	22	61.1	8	42.1
No answer	8	22.2	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.79		Mean: 4.89	

Studied for this course with other students taking it.

	FALL		**SPRING**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	2	5.6	0	
Monthly	3	8.3	0	
Once during term	23	63.9	9	47.4
No answer	8	22.2	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.75		Mean: 5.00	

Participated in some art, drama, or music activity on campus.

	FALL		**SPRING**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	1	2.8	0	
Once during term	26	72.2	9	47.4
No answer	9	25.0	10	52.6
	Mean: 4.96		Mean: 5.00	

Communicated with other New School students via computer.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	0		2	10.5
Weekly	0		5	26.3
Monthly	1	2.8	1	5.3
Once during term	25	69.4	4	21.1
No answer	10	27.8	7	36.8
	Mean: 4.96		Mean: 3.00	

For each of the following items, how often **in this course** did you think or act in the manner described? (Code: 1="Almost always" 2="Frequently" 3="Sometimes" 4="Once in a while" 5="Rarely".)

I saw to it that my schoolwork was carefully planned and organized.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	14	38.9	10	52.6
Frequently	16	44.4	2	10.5
Once in a while	1	2.8	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.61		Mean: 1.17	

Whenever I had difficulty with an assignment, I talked it over with my professor.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	10	27.8	4	21.1
Frequently	4	11.1	2	10.5
Sometimes	7	19.4	2	10.5
Once in a while	4	11.1	2	10.5
Rarely	5	13.9	1	5.3
No answer	6	16.7	8	42.1
	Mean: 2.67		Mean: 2.46	

While taking this course, approximately how many hours did you spend in a typical week working as a paid employee at a job?

FALL
Mean: 28.31 hours Standard deviation: 20.66
Range: 0 hours to 75 hours

SPRING
Mean: 36.25 hours Standard deviation: 22.27
Range: 0 hours to 80 hours

How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of this course? (Scale from 1="Very unsatisfied" to 5="Very satisfied".)

Communications with your professor

FALL
Mean: 4.29 Standard deviation: 0.86

SPRING
Mean: 3.91 Standard deviation: 1.51

Method of course delivery

FALL
Mean: 4.27 Standard deviation: .94

SPRING
Mean: 3.91 Standard deviation: 0.83

Quality of instruction

FALL
Mean: 4.32 Standard deviation: .98

SPRING
Mean: 4.64 Standard deviation: 0.81

Faculty-student relations

FALL
Mean: 4.29 Standard deviation: .90

SPRING
Mean: 4.09 Standard deviation: 1.22

Quality of course materials

FALL
Mean: 4.12 Standard deviation: 1.23

SPRING
Mean: 4.64 Standard deviation: 0.92

Your intellectual development

FALL
Mean: 4.10 Standard deviation: .94

SPRING
Mean: 4.73 Standard deviation: 0.65

Student relations with each other

FALL
Mean: 3.58 Standard deviation: .85

SPRING
Mean: 3.36 Standard deviation: 1.12

Access to library resources

FALL
Mean: 3.87 Standard deviation: 1.11

SPRING
Mean: 3.22 Standard deviation: 1.30

Access to technological/computer resources

FALL
Mean: 2.96 Standard deviation: 1.31

SPRING
Mean: 3.90 Standard deviation: 1.45

Please rate your level of expertise in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FALL
Mean: 3.52 Standard deviation: 1.23

SPRING
Mean: 3.25 Standard deviation: 1.49

Please rate your level of comfort in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FALL
Mean: 3.97 Standard deviation: 1.28

SPRING
Mean: 3.50 Standard deviation: 1.51

(Spring term only): Would you prefer to take this course in a traditional classroom setting or through distance education using telecommunications and computer technologies in your home or office?

	Frequency	Percent
In a classroom	1	5.3
At home/office	7	36.8
No preference	3	15.8
Not sure	1	5.3
No answer	7	36.8

I worked as hard as I could in the course.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	15	41.7	12	63.2
Frequently	11	30.6	0	
Sometimes	4	11.1	0	
Once in a while	1	2.8	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.71		Mean: 1.00	

I kept my assignments up to date.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	20	55.6	8	42.1
Frequently	6	16.7	2	10.5
Sometimes	5	13.9	1	5.3
Once in a while	0		1	5.3
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.52		Mean: 1.58	

I seemed to accomplish all that could be expected by the professor.

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	14	38.9	6	31.6
Frequently	14	38.9	2	10.5
Sometimes	2	5.6	4	21.1
Rarely	1	2.8	0	
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean: 1.71		Mean: 1.83	

Problems outside of school caused me to neglect my schoolwork

	FALL		SPRING	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	5	13.9	2	10.5
Sometimes	7	19.4	3	15.8
Once in a while	9	25.0	1	5.3
Rarely	10	27.8	6	31.6
No answer	5	13.9	7	36.8
	Mean 3.77		Mean: 3.92	

Questionnaire Summary 1994-1995

NOTE: The data reported below for 1994-1995 are from the three FIPSE project courses and approximately twenty other non-FIPSE DIAL courses in the social sciences and humanities. All of the project courses were taught by a different faculty member than those teaching them in 1993-94. Because of the small number of students originally enrolled in the FIPSE courses (6 in the fall and 11 in the spring), and the even smaller number of students completing those courses and completing questionnaires (3 in the fall and 6 in the spring), both the fall and spring term data is combined. The 9 respondents in the FIPSE course represent 53% of the total enrollment in those courses in 1994-95. The 58 respondents from other DIAL courses include students from a cross-section of both fall and spring term social science and humanities courses. Because of technical problems in the administration of on-line questionnaires, not all questions from the prior year were asked of students in 1994-95.

Beginning of Term Questionnaires Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

Please describe your expectations of how often you plan to do each of the following during this course. (Code=1="Daily" 2="Weekly" 3=Every other week" 4="Monthly" 5="At most once during term" 6="Never".)

Use a computer to help complete assignments.

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	4	44.4	20	34.5
Weekly	2	22.2	12	20.7
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

Mean: 1.33

Mean: 1.38

Participate in social activities on campus with other students.

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	0		10	17.2
Every other week	0		4	6.9
Monthly	0		8	13.8
Once during term	2	22.2	2	3.4
Never	4	44.4	8	13.8
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

Mean: 5.67

Mean: 3.81

Participate in social activities off campus with other students.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	0		4	6.9
Monthly	0		6	10.3
Once during term	0		10	17.2
Never	4	44.4	10	17.2
No answer	5	55.6	28	48.3
	Mean: 6.00		Mean: 4.73	

Discuss your career plans and ambitions with an advisor.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	0		8	13.8
Once during term	2	22.2	18	31.0
Never	4	44.4	6	10.3
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8
	Mean: 5.67		Mean: 4.94	

Attend art, music or drama productions on campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	0		2	3.4
Once during term	0		12	20.7
Never	4	44.4	18	31.0
No answer	5	55.6	26	44.8
	Mean: 6.00		Mean: 5.50	

Study for this course with other students taking it.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly			2	3.4
Every other week	0		2	3.4
Monthly	0		2	3.4
Once during term	2	22.2	4	6.9
Never	2	22.2	20	34.5
No answer	5	55.6	28	48.3
	Mean: 5.50		Mean: 5.27	

Participate in some art, drama, or music activity on campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Weekly	0		2	3.4
Monthly	0		2	3.4
Once during term	0		8	13.8
Never	4	44.4	18	31.0
No answer	5	55.6	28	48.3

Mean: 6.0 Mean: 5.33

Communicate with other New School students via computer.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	0		2	3.4
Weekly	0		12	20.7
Every other week	0		4	13.8
Monthly	4	44.4	2	3.4
Once during term	2	22.2	2	3.4
Never	0		6	10.3
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

Mean: 4.33 Mean: 3.25

Would you prefer to take this course in a traditional classroom setting or through distance education using telecommunications and computer technologies in your home or office?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
In a classroom	2	22.2	2	3.4
At home/office	2	22.2	14	24.1
No preference	0		2	3.4
Not sure	0		14	24.1
No answer	5	55.6	26	44.8

How long have you been using personal computers?

FIPSE

Mean: 5.33 years Standard deviation: 4.51 years

Range from 1 to 10 years.

NON-FIPSE

Mean: 4.56 years Standard deviation: 4.32 years

Range from 0 to 15 years.

Please rate your level of expertise in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FIPSE	**NON-FIPSE**
Mean: 2.33 Standard deviation: 0.58	Mean: 2.34 Standard deviation: 1.22

Please rate your level of comfort in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FIPSE	**NON-FIPSE**
Mean: 2.00 Standard deviation: 1.00	Mean: 3.31 Standard deviation: 1.25

While taking this course, approximately how many hours a week do you plan to spend working on a job?

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None	2	22.2	6	10.3
1-9 hours	0		2	3.4
10-19 hours	2	22.2	2	3.4
20-29 hours	0		2	3.4
30-39 hours	2	22.2	4	6.9
40+ hours	0		16	27.6
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

Which of the following income ranges best describes your annual household income?

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
$25,000-$34,999	0		2	3.4
$35,000-$49,999	0		6	10.3
$50,000-$74,999	2	22.2	2	3.4
$75,000-$99,999	0		4	6.9
$100,000+	0		0	
No answer	7	77.8	44	75.9

Which of the following age groupings do you belong to?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
22-24	0		4	6.9
25-29	2	22.2	8	13.8
30-34	0		6	10.3
35-39	0		2	3.4
40-44	2	22.2	2	3.4
45-49	0		4	6.9
50-54	2	22.2	4	6.9
No answer	3	33.3	28	48.3

Which of the following groups best describes your ethnicity?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Native American	0		2	3.4
White	4	44.4	22	37.9
Latino/Hispanic	0		2	3.4
Other	0		2	3.4
No answer	5	55.6	30	51.7

Are you presently enrolled as

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Full-time student	0		8	13.8
Part-time student	6	66.7	24	41.4
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

Into which of the following general categories does your main interest fall?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Humanities	4	44.4	2	6.9
Business	0		1	3.4
Communications	0		1	3.4
Education	0		1	3.4
Health related fields	0		1	3.4
Social sciences	0		9	31.0
Other	0		1	3.4
No answer	5	55.6	13	44.8

What is your sex?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Female	4	44.4	14	24.1
Male	2	22.2	18	31.0
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

What is the highest academic degree you plan to obtain?

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's degree	2	22.2	6	10.3
Master's degree	2	22.2	4	6.9
Doctorate	2	22.2	12	20.7
Professional degree	0		10	17.2
No answer	3	33.3	26	44.8

End of Term Course Evaluation Fall 1994 and Spring 1995

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. (Code: 1="Strongly agree" 2="Agree" 3=Neither agree or disagree" 4="Disagree" 5="Strongly disagree".)

I feel that I have had access to all the materials I need to succeed in this course.

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		16	27.6
Agree	4	44.4	10	17.2
Neutral	2	22.2	4	6.9
Disagree	0		4	6.9
Strongly disagree	0		4	6.9
No answer	3	33.3	20	34.5
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 2.21	

This course has been difficult for me.

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		4	6.9
Agree	0		4	6.9
Neutral	2	22.2	6	10.3
Disagree	2	22.2	20	34.5
Strongly disagree	2	22.2	12	20.7
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 4.00		Mean: 3.70	

I have had sufficient one on one communication with the professor in this course.

	FIPSE		**NON-FIPSE**	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		14	24.1
Agree	0		2	3.4
Neutral	0		2	3.4
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0
	Mean: --		Mean: 1.33	

It is important for me to graduate with a degree from the New School.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		22	37.9
Agree	2	22.2	4	6.9
Neutral	0		6	10.3
Disagree	0		2	3.4
Strongly disagree	0		12	20.7
No answer	7	77.8	12	20.7
	Mean: 2.00		Mean: 2.18	

The professor in this course has been an effective communicator.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	36	62.1
Agree	0		6	10.3
Neutral	2	22.2	0	
Disagree	2	22.2	0	
Strongly disagree	0		2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1
	Mean: 2.67		Mean: 1.32	

I found this course to be intellectually stimulating.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	32	55.2
Agree	0		8	13.8
Neutral	2	22.2	4	6.9
Disagree	2	22.2	2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 2.67		Mean 1.42	

My professor appears to be sensitive to my interests, needs and aspirations as a student.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	28	48.3
Agree	0		10	17.2
Neutral	2	22.2	2	3.4
Disagree	0		0	
Strongly disagree	0		2	3.4
No answer	5	55.6	16	27.6
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 1.52	

There is a strong sense of community, a feeling of shared interests and purpose among the students taking this course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	18	31.0
Agree	2	22.2	16	27.6
Neutral	2	22.2	6	10.3
Disagree	0		4	6.9
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1
	Mean: 2.00		Mean: 1.91	

The professor in this course has had a strong impact on my intellectual development.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	14	24.1
Agree	0		20	34.5
Neutral	2	22.2	6	10.3
Disagree	2	22.2	0	
Strongly disagree	0		2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	16	27.6
	Mean: 2.67		Mean: 1.83	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If I were taking this course again, I would prefer to take this course off campus via telecommunications or correspondence rather than on campus.

	FIPSE Frequency	FIPSE Percent	NON-FIPSE Frequency	NON-FIPSE Percent
Strongly agree	4	44.4	22	37.9
Agree	0		10	17.2
Neutral	0		6	10.3
Strongly disagree	2	22.2	6	10.3
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 2.05	

It has been difficult for me to communicate with other students taking this course.

	FIPSE Frequency	FIPSE Percent	NON-FIPSE Frequency	NON-FIPSE Percent
Strongly agree	0		8	13.8
Agree	0		4	6.9
Neutral	2	22.2	8	13.8
Disagree	2	22.2	10	17.2
Strongly disagree	2	22.2	14	24.1
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1
	Mean: 4.00		Mean: 3.41	

I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to take this course.

	FIPSE Frequency	FIPSE Percent	NON-FIPSE Frequency	NON-FIPSE Percent
Strongly agree	0		14	24.1
Agree	0		4	6.9
Neutral	0		0	
Disagree	0		2	3.4
No answer	9	100.0	38	65.5
	Mean: --		Mean: 1.50	

I took this course mainly out of interest in the subject and not necessarily because of my interest in pursuing a degree.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	24	41.4
Agree	2	22.2	6	10.3
Neutral	2	22.2	6	10.3
Disagree	0		10	17.2
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 2.00		Mean: 2.04	

It is important for me to get a high grade in this course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		12	20.7
Agree	2	22.2	10	17.2
Neutral	0		6	10.3
Disagree	0		8	13.8
Strongly disagree	0		10	17.2
No answer	7	77.8	12	20.7
	Mean: 2.00		Mean: 2.87	

The faculty member for this course is a good teacher.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Agree	0		10	17.2
Neutral	0		10	17.2
No answer	9	100.0	38	65.5
	Mean: --		Mean: 2.50	

I feel that I met the intellectual goals I had for this course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		16	27.6
Agree	4	44.4	16	27.6
Neutral	0		6	10.3
Disagree	0		6	10.3
Strongly disagree	2	22.2	2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 3.00		Mean: 2.17	

It has been easy for me to develop a good working relationship with the faculty member teaching this course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	22.2	16	27.6
Agree	0		16	27.6
Disagree	4	44.4	0	
Strongly disagree	0		6	10.3
No answer	3	33.3	20	34.5
	Mean: 3.00		Mean: 2.05	

I am satisfied with my intellectual development since enrolling in this course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		12	20.7
Agree	0		2	3.4
Neutral	0		2	3.4
Disagree	0		2	3.4
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0
	Mean: --		Mean: 1.67	

This course would be of equal *quality* regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		18	31.0
Agree	0		14	24.1
Disagree	2	22.2	8	13.8
Strongly disagree	4	44.4	2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	16	27.6
	Mean: 4.67		Mean: 2.10	

This course would be of equal *value* to me regardless of whether it is taught on campus or through telecommunications off campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0		10	17.2
Agree	0		2	3.4
Neutral	0		6	10.3
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0
	Mean: --		Mean: 1.83	

I would prefer to take this course on campus with faculty members present rather than off campus via telecommunications.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Agree	0		2	3.4
Neutral	0		4	6.9
Disagree	0		6	10.3
Strongly disagree	0		6	10.3
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0
	Mean: --		Mean: 3.89	

How often have you done each of the following since enrolling in this course? (Code: 1="Daily" 2="Weekly" 3="Every other week" 4="Monthly" 5="At most once during term" 6="Never".)

Used a computer to help complete assignments.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	0		12	20.7
Weekly	0		8	13.8
No answer	9	100.0	38	65.5

Mean: -- Mean: 1.40

Participated in social activities on campus with other students.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	2	22.2	2	3.4
Once during term	0		10	17.2
Never	4	44.4	32	55.2
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1

Mean: 5.00 Mean: 5.67

Participated in social activities off campus with other students.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	4	44.4	0	
Once during term	0		10	17.2
Never	2	22.2	34	58.6
No answer	3	33.3	14	24.1

Mean: 4.00 Mean: 5.77

Discussed your career plans and ambitions with an advisor.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	2	22.2	6	10.3
Once during term	2	22.2	16	27.6
Never	2	22.2	24	41.4
No answer	3	33.9	12	20.7

Mean: 5.00 Mean: 5.39

Attended art, music or drama productions on campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Every other week	0		2	3.4
Once during term	0		10	17.2
Never	4	44.4	32	55.2
No answer	5	55.6	14	24.1

Mean: 6.00 Mean: 5.64

Studied for this course with other students taking it.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	0		2	3.4
Once during term	0		4	6.9
Never	0		12	20.7
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0

Mean: -- Mean: 5.56

Participated in some art, drama, or music activity on campus.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Once during term	0		6	10.3
Never	0		12	20.7
No answer	9	100.0	40	69.0

Mean: -- Mean: 5.67

Communicated with other New School students via computer.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Daily	4	44.4	8	13.8
Weekly	0		8	13.8
Monthly	0		8	13.8
Once during term	0		14	24.1
Never	2	22.2	4	6.9
No answer	3	33.3	16	27.6

Mean: 2.67 Mean: 3.57

For each of the following items, how often **in this course** did you think or act in the manner described? (Code: 1="Almost always" 2="Frequently" 3="Sometimes" 4="Once in a while" 5="Rarely".)

I saw to it that my schoolwork was carefully planned and organized.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	4	44.4	26	44.8
Frequently	0		6	10.3
Sometimes	0		6	10.3
Once in a while	0		2	3.4
Rarely	2	22.2	2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	16	27.6
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 1.76	

Whenever I had difficulty with an assignment, I talked it over with my professor.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	4	44.4	14	24.1
Frequently	0		6	10.3
Sometimes	0		14	24.1
Rarely	2	22.2	12	20.7
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 2.78	

I worked as hard as I could in the course.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	6	66.7	28	48.3
Frequently	0		10	17.2
Sometimes	0		8	13.8
No answer	3	33.9	12	20.7
	Mean: 1.00		Mean: 1.57	

I kept my assignments up to date.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	4	44.4	18	31.0
Frequently	2	22.2	16	27.6
Sometimes	0		6	10.3
Once in a while	0		4	6.9
Rarely	0		2	3.4
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 1.33		Mean: 2.04	

I seemed to accomplish all that could be expected by the professor.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	4	44.4	14	24.1
Frequently	0		14	24.1
Sometimes	0		2	3.4
Once in a while	0		4	6.9
Rarely	2	22.2	8	13.8
No answer	3	33.3	16	27.6
	Mean: 2.33		Mean: 2.48	

Problems outside of school caused me to neglect my schoolwork.

	FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Almost always	0		4	6.9
Frequently	0		6	10.3
Sometimes	2	22.2	4	6.9
Once in a while	0		14	24.1
Rarely	4	44.4	18	31.0
No answer	3	33.3	12	20.7
	Mean: 4.33		Mean: 3.78	

While taking this course, approximately how many hours did you spend in a typical week working as a paid employee at a job?

FIPSE

Mean: 28.31 hours Standard deviation: 20.66

Range: 0 hours to 75 hours

NON-FIPSE No responses received

How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of this course? (Scale from 1="Very unsatisfied" to 5="Very satisfied".)

Communications with your professor

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 2.00 Standard deviation: 1.41	Mean: 4.27 Standard deviation: 1.20

Method of course delivery

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 4.00 Standard deviation: 1.73	Mean: 3.91 Standard deviation: 0.83

Quality of instruction

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 3.00 Standard deviation: 1.73	Mean: 4.27 Standard deviation: 1.42

Faculty-student relations

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 3.67 Standard deviation: 1.53	Mean: 4.27 Standard deviation: 1.20

Quality of course materials

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
No responses received	Mean: 4.79 Standard deviation: 0.44

Your intellectual development

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 4.00 Standard deviation: 0.00	Mean: 3.86 Standard deviation: 1.32

Student relations with each other

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
No responses received	Mean: 3.33 Standard deviation: 1.50

Access to library resources

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 5.00 Standard deviation: 1.73	Mean: 3.22 Standard deviation: 1.47

Access to technological/computer resources

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
No responses received	Mean: 4.00 Standard deviation: 1.53

Please rate your level of expertise in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FIPSE	NON-FIPSE
Mean: 4.33 Standard deviation: 1.16	Mean: 3.69 Standard deviation: 1.25

Please rate your level of comfort in using personal computers. (Scale from 1="Low" to 5="High".)

FIPSE		NON-FIPSE	
Mean: 4.33	Standard deviation: 1.16	Mean: 3.96	Standard deviation: 1.25

Open-ended questionnaire item detail

1993-1994 FIPSE courses

Beginning of term (*=classroom course, no mark=on-line course)

Intellectual goals for course

* I am a dancer who seeks a well rounded view of the arts (particularly those that interest me such as literature, film and music) in order to enhance my approach to dance (more specifically, the eventual creation of my own dance pieces). This course seems to cover (according to its descriptions in the catalogue) a wide range of perspectives and social commentary that can lead me to this end.

* An integrated approach to subjects I'm interested in -racism, national/regional identity - generational changes. A better self-understanding - can we change "identity" at will? Or is "it" a permanent if fluctuating state? What about interaction with others, if you're constantly changing?

* I hope this course will serve as a stimulation to explore its subject in depth, and in many directions. I also expect it to provide me with some tools to understand some of the things that I, personally, was going through in the transition from one society to the other. Needless to say, I expect to enjoy the class sessions as well as the readings. So far, it looks very good.

* A better understanding of people and their relations with themselves, each other, and the world at large - as well as an introduction to some of the scholars in the world of sociology.

* The experience of collaborating on this project. To learn for myself what the differences are between classroom and distance learning. The subject matter is equally interesting.

* Intellectually I don't want to limit myself to my imagination. I hope to learn about the complexities of identity. Perhaps come across some interesting authors or ideas etc.

* I plan to get a more in-depth view of sociological studies. I've only taken an introductory course which I found interesting and wanted to explore the subject matter further.

* I am a computer hobbyist and an occasional student of social sciences. I may take a master's or attempt some writing (or multi-media work).

* I'd like to gain some familiarity with the writing and other art under discussion.

* A better understanding of the contexts of and relationships between works of literature, art and music in the 20th century, in the US.

* As a student of anthropology, I was interested in the way this course approaches the idea of American culture from many different angles (i.e. literature, art, photography, music, dance). I hope to learn more about the artists as we study them individually and to also have a new perspective on the aspects that are common throughout their works.

* To become familiar with writers, photographers, ideology not my own - to enhance my own knowledge - to become more well read/aware - to learn - to learn more about other people's experiences of life & their interpretations.

* A better understanding of the influences and events in American history that have contributed to the American attitudes and ways that are present today. I am interested in those things that are uniquely American traits, and not traits that can be applied to humans throughout the world no matter what country they live in or are from.

* I would like to have a wider knowledge of the forces which have influenced American culture in the 20th century. I would like to be able to speak about these forces on a higher semantic plane.

* I hope to become a much better critical reader; to overcome my fear of writing papers (which is in part a function of the 17-year hiatus in my academic education); to gain some insight into a variety of 20th century cultural influences; and to develop a number of opinions on those influences in relation to each other. I also want to learn "a way in" to some of those texts that are less accessible to me.

* An understanding of what philosophical dilemmas can be discovered through an analysis of a technological society.

* I would hope that this course would/will facilitate and increase my scant knowledge of this area plus at the same time participate in and area of knowledge which is new and sometimes never debated seriously in public.

* I'd like a better grip on the pros and cons of technology. New ways of using technology the moral and ethical complications involved in advancement and perhaps a positive attitude toward computers as a by-product.

* A better, deeper understanding about the materials, many of which I'm already interested in but have never explored in a formal way.

* It's often helpful to know your enemy - the authors up for discussion (Jerry Mander, Nel Postman) seem to me nostalgists capitalizing on people's fears of new technology. Nevertheless they need to be addressed if a non-bankrupt understanding of technology is to be reached.

* I feel this program is important for future students - in finishing their degrees.

* I would like to understand what Gertrude Stein is talking about. I find her writings repetitive and complex.

* I hope to gain a better understanding of all the factors contributing to the making of this country. I have mainly concentrated my studies in the past in the arts, and I wanted to explore a broader view.

* Broad range of information on prominent American talents.

* I am hoping to understand some of the issues that are brought to bear on corporate and academic education by the technology that is becoming almost mandatory in our world today. There is pressure on both students and corporate workers to be proficient and knowledgeable in technological arenas that they may be psychologically unprepared for. I would like to work towards improving the preparation process.

* Two things. First, an insight into the way a course is put together from scratch. Second, a broader multidisciplinary experience in contemporary/modern American history.

* An understanding of the role technology plays in today's society. To learn where technology is headed.

* I plan to organize and produce literary and visual works for the purpose of educating children. Also to organize community grassroots based sessions for the purpose of exposing technology to those who are techno-illiterate.

* Equipped to give a thorough assessment of my identity versus what's going on in and around the universe.

* Background information to social thought, trends and better understanding of my inner self.

* Exposure to a variety of literature and art with which I have had little or no experience.

* A basic (introductory) understanding of reality: how it is created, interpreted, and reacted to by individuals in a social context.

* To ground my self as I gain more knowledge about computers. I would like to keep a positive attitude about how I can utilize this technology with positive outcomes. An understanding of where science ends and technology begins, and to define good from bad in these areas.

* I want to be able to integrate, or begin to integrate, theories about technology into my worldview.

* An awareness of other perspectives. A framework for evaluating dilemmas of modern society.

Better understanding of individual, personality and society.

To further my knowledge of, and interest in, modern culture. To examine the intersecting influences of art and psychology on contemporary culture.

It's my first sociology course. Hopefully a perspective on the roots of sociology, how sociologists think/view the world, the link between sociology and psychology.

A deeper understanding of the relation of and construction of identity via cultural constructs.

I hope to explore the process of sociology. I am interested in the idea of "identity" and its role in development. I am also interested in computers and this new form of education.

I tend toward arts/humanities, so I wanted to go the other way and hopefully feel less dense about technotrends, etc. I also wanted the skill of computer conferencing.

I plan to apply what I partake of in the course to my life and to the times in which we live. I wish to open my mind through education, which will kindle my "flame of growth" as an individual.

A greater understanding of the impact this century has had on western culture up to now. The contributions made by Americans are the subject matter, so specifically I wish to consider these contributions, noting similarities and origins and follow, if possible, their effects to the present day.

I'd like to learn more about technology and its effects - both positive and negative - on society. What are its ramifications? What are the questions we should be asking and why are some questions not being asked in the media about technology? Technology is becoming more and more a part of our lives and I want to be participating in it.

To examine the effects of technology on people and the environment. I am interested in learning more about the "information age" and the effect it is having on all of us. I am interested in computer technology and the many changes that it will bring about, as well as the history or technological changes and other effects on society as they evolve.

A better understanding of how technology impacts my life and that of my family.

I have been an elementary teacher for 30 years and I am currently teaching kindergarten. My classroom does not have a computer and I know next to nothing about computers or the technological world; yet many of the children in my room at age 5 have extensive knowledge about computers. Therefore, I decided this might be a good way to find out something about the technological world now and as it is envisioned in the future and at the same time actually begin to use a computer at school. My goals are 1) to begin using a computer. 2) to explore the technological world and its implications for society. 3) to think about technology in relation to education in general and to my classroom in particular.

Exposure to authors, artists and poets that I otherwise would not.

My attraction to this course is because of the diverse subject matter. I have an extreme interest in art - particularly photography - I have always been interested in American photography and its relationships to other art forms such as the ones in the course outline, i.e. poetry, literature.

I have worked for 23 years as a technician at NY Telephone so "technology" has been my source of employment. Lately my occupation has gone through wild fluctuations, which has made me more interested in the subject of technology in its larger implications.

I hope to have a better understanding of the way the world works and man's role in it and the society he has created.

Social goals for course

* Some good stimulating and challenging discussions.

* Sharing ideas.

* I have no plans or goals. Obviously I would be very happy to meet interesting people. I hope that the atmosphere of the class sessions will provide a comfortable background for an honest discussion.

* I think my academic and social goals are interrelated.

* I don't plan to get anything out of the course socially other than to interact with class members during any discussions.

* Well maybe I'll be able to socialize in a more bohemian orbit.

* Interesting discussions, contrasting or different opinions/perspectives, meeting people from different "categories" in NY as opposed to the mass of art students I meet in all other classes.

* I enjoy meeting fellow students and discussing issues; both relevant issues to the course and personal interests but did not enroll in this course with the intention of making new friends.

* Anytime you open yourself up to other ideas - it gives you a different outlook on life/the world/ other people/the universe. I didn't come to this course thinking it would enhance my social life. If, however taking this course for my own edification adds to my social life - bravo.

* I hope to gain a deeper insight into the history and experience that influence people in America.

* I haven't thought at all about the social benefits of taking this class.

* I would like to develop new interests and interact with my fellows socially.

* I have no particular social plans for this course although I do hope the class develops an attitude of support and encouragement for each student's ideas.

* Society is a reflection of the crises that exist today in the humanities - this course will help me clarify some of the issues giving rise to this crisis - e.g. technological society.

* I don't know. I go to school to learn not socialize. I hope that doesn't sound cynical. But I always enjoy meeting new people and engaging in exchange as a part of education. I guess I didn't take the class to build a social life. But new friends are always welcome.

* I hope to understand what this course represents. I find that it does not represent Native American nor African and Latino Americans.

* Be capable of socializing in any aspect of identity.

* Better communication skills. Heightened sensitivity to human differences individually and culturally.

* Interaction in discussions with other students.

* Challenge of my beliefs and understanding of social behavior.

* Talking with people in the class and exchanging some ideas.

* Intellectual dialogue.

I have none - other than to learn to use the computer to interact and communicate with others.

Probably none! More interested in info exchange, even "networking", if that term still applies. Maybe that is socializing, however.

Socially, I will read, receive, hear and respond to the thoughts of others - even though I can't see them I know they are there. It is comforting to communicate in this medium and a wonderful way to express through words.

Other than a polishing up of my epistolary writing skills, I have none. I will consider meeting with classmates should there be an interest.

I'm curious to see what it's like to communicate through a modem and compare it with person-to-person contact. It will be interesting to see how relationships develop or do not develop.

I haven't any expectations socially other than to communicate with and meet others who are interested in the same subjects, writing, technology and its impact on society.

Socially this course will definitely broaden my horizon both in art and literature - this will aid with my ability to understand and participate in a social conversation or at a gallery or museum.

A better understanding of how a technologically driven society might seem less predestined in the way sources of employment (such as my own) or social interaction (telephone calls, data transmission, on-line education) impact quality of life.

I plan to meet interesting and attractive New School BA students.

Preference for taking course in a classroom or by distance learning

* Classroom. It would take much more effort and time to type out all of one's ideas and opinions on the subject and if a professor had to deal with 10-15 pupils his responses would not be as elaborate as they would be in a classroom.

* Classroom. This subject itself could be isolating!

* Classroom. I always prefer a one to one conversation. I like to see the people whom I talk to. It's a whole different thing to come to class and have a group interaction, than to sit at home and type and be typed to.

* Classroom. I prefer to be able to have verbal face-to-face communication. However, I think taking the class via a computer would shed a different - and just as valuable - understanding to the subject and to the process of learning itself.

* Classroom. I would like to experience both!

* Classroom. I love the classroom environment and interacting with other students and teachers.

* Classroom. I feel there is much more energy and brainstorming in a classroom environment - or rather the possibility of it.

* Classroom. I haven't tried telecommunicated courses.

* Classroom. There are people in a classroom.

* Classroom. Although modern technology enables quick and efficient communication, the opportunity to discuss things directly is worth more.

* Classroom. The classroom experience allows me to think out loud, in a way, and to broaden my ideas and approaches to particular works through in class discussion with other students.

* Classroom. Because the interaction between people is often essential in my experience. I feel that hearing other people's interpretations help to solidify my own opinions.

* Classroom. I enjoy the dynamics of the classroom - discussion, debate, disagreement - all these elements contribute to the learning experience.

* Classroom. The classroom provides a settings consecrated to learning and free of distractions.

* Classroom. I personally need face to face feedback and encouragement from a teacher.

* Classroom. This course needs humans to interact with humans. Machines are to be excluded here.

* Classroom. By coming into the classroom I feel there is opportunities for greater social contact and interaction. This I feel helps clarify points in relation to the required reading. Furthermore I found the idea of using a computer to take the place of the classroom vulgar.

* Classroom. I think taking class at home is good only when you have the flu or are immobilized. I believe in seminar style learning and exposing oneself to all kinds of people. At home is just too isolationist for my blood. But it can be convenient for people who can't get to school - single parents etc. with limited funds.

* Not sure. I'd like to take some courses via DIAL next semester. I was interested in this class because of the material; in a way I wanted to "save" the DIAL courses because I might move further away from the New School (I live very near now).

* At home/office. For the novelty - I've never done it before and it would be interesting to see whether the structure could take advantage of networking's flexibility. It might spin off into groups, be marked by fierce and vicious debate (which would be great -it's easier to yell at a computer screen), or fail if the structure is too rigid, pre-packaged questions, etc.

* At home/office. Better time management for some.

* At home/office. I like working independently.

* Not sure. Personally, I am not sure if I would be disciplined enough to take a class through distance learning, although the idea is appealing.

* Not sure. Too early to tell, but I believe the course would need drastic changes before it could be offered as an on-line program.

* Not sure. The impersonal feeling generated by computers makes me hesitant.

* Not sure. I'm not sure of the level of interaction with the professor if it were to be taken on the line.

* Not sure. But I feel that it would be an asset with your own computer.

* Not sure. I'm not familiar with using computers via modem, therefore, I feel I can't give an honest answer. It's too soon to say how traditional classroom setting will effect my interest in the subject. So far, traditional form seems okay.

* Not sure. Although I enjoy the classroom setting and face to face interaction, I would be open to experimenting with other types of dialog and pacing the class in a manner which would allow one to "attend class" at his/her convenience.

* Not sure. face to face discussions are faster, challenging and don't have a dependence on phone lines. Classroom setting gives less time to expand or expound.

* Not sure. I've never taken a course via computer. I have used computers and BBS extensively, but I really don't see how it can replace an active classroom dialogue involving 10-20 people, or how an instructor can grade a student.

Not sure. I think your familiarity with the subject will dictate how hard or easy a course will be on-line.

At home/office. I cannot travel to New York weekly and prefer to learn the new technology.

At home/office. Eliminated time pressure. I can review notes at any hour of the night, and it gives me great freedom with my work travel plans.

At home/office. Frees up my evenings for other necessary appointments.

I have a tight schedule, and cannot always make time for classes, and am not always in a situation.where I can give the material my full attention at different classroom situations, at home I can log on and leave (?) when I feel my learning situation is optimal.

Not sure. It is too early to know how this class will be. So far I am pleased and I am finding the experience.

At home/office. Whole point is to learn to use the computer better.

At home/office. It is doubly convenient to be able to take class by computer. It saves tome and money. I'm thrilled!

In a classroom. Although I do consider this set-up an opportunity to become more comfortable with computer technology.

Not sure. I will not know until I actually experience it on-line! This is my first course On-line and this particular course will be interesting in that it's about technology, taught by a new technology. You actually practice what you're studying and may glean first-hand the "philosophical dilemmas."

Not sure. I haven't tried this before, so I'll know which I prefer after taking the course.

Not sure. Since this is my first class via computer I have no basis for comparison.

No preference. I think that as long as a student completes all assignments and readings and participates in discussions about subject matter, value can be obtained whether "live" or distance learning. In my case, I would not be taking classes if it were not for DIAL.

At home/office. Due to my busy schedule I couldn't have been happier to take this class at home at my convenience. Since I work full time and also attend school full-time - a class like this will help with a lot of anxiety - due to time constraints.

At home/office. 1) Easier for full-time employed father of two with working wife. 2) Interested in telecommunications education because I'm a switching technician at NYNEX.
At home/office. I think it is more exciting this way and offers the possibility of more composed responses than the classroom.

1993-1994 FIPSE courses

Course evaluation (on-line courses only; classroom course questionnaires did not include these questions)

Please comment on any aspects of this course which you found particularly satisfying.

Although I complained early and often about the amount of writing and preparation our course required, the cumulative effect of the work is enlightening and satisfying. I now wish my entire education had been conducted in this way because I think the process of writing helps the student more completely "own" their learning experience.

I thought this course was extremely well-organized and laid out in such a way that a student received a very rich grounding in the subject matter. The readings were excellent and pertinent, the guest professors were varied in their viewpoints and enthusiastic and the student-led discussions were very strong. The professor was an excellent guide and conductor of this course, as well as having a fount of information and very supportive of each individual student.

The convenience of a flexible schedule, learning at my most optimal time, not the assigned class time.

It's convenient, saves time, still accomplishes higher learning. Fun to join in on unconventional classroom - "cyberspace". Comforting working with a computer and not traveling extra for night school.

The reading was wonderful. I also enjoyed what my teacher had to say and add about the subject, she kept it interesting and enjoyable.

[The professor] communicates well.

I enjoyed very much being able to study at any time.

I enjoyed course material greatly. I enjoyed learning to communicate via computer.

Please comment on any aspects of this course which you found particularly unsatisfying.

I think our class had difficulty interacting with each other, both on the class material and on a more casual basis. However, I think the class kept on trying up until the last day of class. I think this aspect of on-line education will improve as people have more on-line experiences.

I simply did not have the computer expertise to do the course with ease. The technical aspects were a problem for me and with a demanding full-time job I had a difficulty time overcoming my technical deficiencies.

The nature of the discourse was definitely effected by the nature of the course presentation, and of course my lack of typing skills made it difficult to continue any sort of prolonged conversation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One guest teacher provoked hostility from some students. He was personally offensive and rude. I reacted by not responding to his queries. I refuse to allow that behavior to ruin my educational pursuits.

Trying to get on line at the beginning of the course was extremely difficult for me.

I thought that several students were not as interested in intellectual development as I was. I thought that there was too much emphasis on what we felt, not what we thought or how we reasoned. I found little interest in learning more about my classmates.

There was not enough course instruction from the professor. We need more "lecture", guidance and commentary on our commentary. Students seemed to be communicating without much feedback. Also - there was too much work for the course. We had to be on-line 4/5 times per week with commentary...hard to keep up with assignments.

Preference for classroom or on-line courses

No preference. Because I do not live within commuting distance to campus, distance education is my only option. However each educational setting - traditional and distance - has advantages. I very much enjoyed (in the end) how the distance learning classroom forces the student to write more frequently. The traditional classroom has a more fast-paced and spontaneous discussion and a more casual or social atmosphere.

Not sure. I liked taking this course on the computer and I learned not only the course material - but also a great deal about using computers. However, I missed the in-person interaction of a traditional course.

In a classroom. I felt that because of the technological processes, typing, sending and so forth, that dialogue was limited by the labor involved, as well as the cool medium, I felt wasn't as conducive of discussion.

No preference. It all depends on the subject - I think some are better studied in a classroom with face-to-face instruction.

No preference. There would be a better exchange on DIAL, but I wouldn't know the other students as well.

At home/office. I cannot be at school - time and distance make that impossible. I enjoyed the comfort of telecommunicating from home on my time schedule.

At home/office. Taking it using telecommunications was perfect for my lifestyle (lots of travel and irregular hours.)

* I'm on leave of absence from Wellesley College, and this was the only way I could take classes.

* Need to be home more, course content, discount on tuition, in that order.

* Flexibility.

* A way to attend another class without taking up work time.

* I love my computer.

* Wanted experience on internet/ and wanted to learn physics.

* The nature of the course: fiction writing, the caliber of the faculty, the ease of participation, and the ability to log on and off in my own time.

* I needed this course to complete my master's degree and this was the only elective available.

* Interested in new technologies.

* I live in Texas.

* Convenience. Also, I knew it would be educational in terms of the internet.

* Time flexibility.

* Time and place.

* I was looking for a UNIX course. This was the perfect opportunity.

* The technology and I don't live in NYC.

* Continuing education.

* My lack of knowledge in computer systems. I have been trying to find some kind of course to teach myself about computers. Also I wanted to practice my Spanish.

* Convenience and opportunity to learn how to use a computer.

* Convenience.

* I wanted to increase my knowledge about the Internet. If I could get a graduate degree via my computer, I would do it for that reason as well.

* I liked the ideal of learning at home and the way the material is presented, I mean the format.

* Convenience.

* Have been very busy and was curious how it would work.

* I really needed a computer course and this is the only way I can take one at New School.

* Training need and curiosity to see how an on-line course would work.

* Previous on-line experience.

* Time constraints...very busy schedule - lots of travel

* Convenience.

* Flexibility in attending class * applicable, interesting course selection.

* My advisor said it would be fun.

* Travel.

* Advisor.

* Flexible hours.

* Flexibility of scheduling.

* Convenience and I wanted to try it out. I travel a lot for work.

* The ability to log on and work when I choose.

* To work with my own schedule.

* Flexibility.

* I wanted to take the class that was offered.

* Curious to see if it really worked.

* I was hoping to make my full course load a little more manageable this semester.

* The convenience.

* The attractiveness of taking a writing class on-line, plus the half price offer to take a DIAL course for alumni.

* Time.

* Interesting use of new technology, convenience, flexibility.

* Interest in offerings and timeliness. I own a small production company and my time is very restricted. DIAL lets me learn when I can.

* My schedule.

* A very busy schedule; also, a similar course not available weeknights.

* Convenient, kind of cool.

* Convenience.

* New medium.

* I have no urge to commute to Manhattan.

* Because of my work schedule, it is hard to get to school to take classes and so DIAL was the perfect solution.

* The subject of course.

* Commuting is almost impossible.

* It was convenient and intriguing.

* Convenience.

* Time constraints at work and flexibility of the on-line.

* Convenience.

* The classes offered and the on-line format.

* Thought it would save time, and I wanted to learn how to work on-line.

* The convenience.

* My work and lack of time to attend classes.

* Convenience.

* The sale price for credit students.

* Time saving aspects, curiosity, newfound interest in being on-line.

* Interest in class.

* Only way offered.

* The need to take a course on my own time.

* Both the course content and the experience of seeing if this method was useful for learning

Intellectual goals for course

Enrich my knowledge of modern info. theory, expand my contacts and theories on media development, continue acquiring credits towards an embarrassingly unfinished Undergrad degree, check out New School as potential finishing university, share my excitement with developing comm. technologies with others in my groups of interest.

1) Course material is intellectually stimulating; 2) To expand academic knowledge, background through "new" reading, etc. materials, both required by instructor and recommended by participants; 3) To comparatively/practically evaluate electronic course (in relation to other courses, systems, moderators, strategies, etc.).

I am a psychology major and feel this class may offer knowledge that will aid me in my chosen field.

Better understanding of the world we live in and greater understanding of my self of my self.

* To write more.

* To start writing stories again.

* To finish my last four credits and get my BA, to improve my poetry.

* To be exposed to this subject matter and to interact with someone who has done some thinking about it.

* To get a better grounding in my education.

* More info, hands on distance learning.

* To be a proficient C++ programmer, and to get a programming job.

* To get the credits for a degree, to inform myself, to improve my writing skills, etc.

* To learn all I can on this particular subject.

* Find out how playwriting is taught over computer.

* Just to build my German translation skills.

* To learn about the subject of business ethics and family ethics from different viewpoints.

* Get grounding in subject to improve negotiation for consulting practice.

* To better understand current social issues and theory.

* To learn to write better.

* Not the computer, I am only interested in the Beuys info.

* I have been researching Beuys for a while but have had difficulty as much information is in German. I am interested in his art work but also the philosophies and ideas for education, ideologies, etc.

* Learn how to operate in an on-line environment. Explore literature and concepts dealing with multi-culturalism.

* Because I wanted to learn what was being taught.

* I wish to establish a foundation in gender studies with this class, foundations of feminism, since other similar courses are only offered during the afternoons and as I work full-time and can only take evening classes this DIAL course fit my needs. Currently, I am a BA candidate.

* Increase my skills at speaking Chinese while increasing my computer skills.

* Intellectually to be able to communicate on-line with whatever technology problems arise [many so far]. Academically - to update my computer skills and learning.

* BA, personal enrichment.

* Want to develop writing skills using in-class criticism.

* Intellectually, I hope to learn and grow in areas that otherwise I wouldn't probably. I would also like to build a community even if on-line for now. Academically, I hope to proceed into the MA/BA program, currently I am a BA student. Practically I hope that these skills will help me in my line of work, journalism.

* A complete overview and intro to the internet and superhighway. It is good to get varied views from the prof and other students. It's not something I get every day being in a small company.

* To learn more about the classics, to write better and to understand more about society.

* To finish a feature length screenplay.

* To examine family dynamics.

* Improve my Chinese.

* Support, mostly. Also the possibility of having discussions on philosophical and educational issues, which do not occur now.

* To improve my business writing skills.

* To structure my writing, get other's opinions, insight.

* To continue to learn how to write a film. To become more familiar with the writing skills. To get feedback on my writing.

* To write a treatment and draft screenplay in order to interest a producer.

* Looking for introduction to subject. Hoping to be back in school again in the near future and looked for a class to get me back in school mode.

* To better my knowledge.

* I wanted to learn about fiction writing.

* Learn more UNIX as I use it at work.

* Learn about Latin American music, improve Spanish.

* Understand basics of feminism. Continue my education in non-job related fields.

* Practically - to help with work, academically - because I'm good at foreign languages.

* working on BA.

* To improve.

* Acquire knowledge of a programming language.

* To learn UNIX as an extension of my interest in computing. To learn physics in a bit more detail than I have previously done from personal reading/experience.

* Very, very interested in topics covered.

* To better understand how to use a computer and learn computer terminology.

* In 219, my goal is to apply the learning from this class to my job. In class 918, my goal is to gain a greater understanding of our world and be able to apply the theoretical learning to everyday situations.

* Learn basics of UNIX and experience an on-line course.

* Explore new areas for and approaches to my writing.

* To learn how to use the computer and to fulfill my sabbatical requirements.

* I plan to gain knowledge and understanding of the world and the people that make up the world. Since moving from Texas to NYC, I think the course I am taking will help.

* Become a better teacher.

* I hope to have vast knowledge of the Information Superhighway and the Internet so that I can make informed recommendations to my company about where we should go in the future to market and provide our products.

* Gain a better understanding of computer systems so that I may be more valuable to my firm. To practice my Spanish and learn more about Latin American music.

* Better understanding of mythology applied to current themes in fiction and film.

* My goal is to utilize what I learn at work. And feel more comfortable.

* I get some writing practice.

Q: How often do you expect students in this course to use a computer to complete assignments?

A: #1: **Monthly**
#2: **Weekly**
#3: **Weekly**

Q: When this course is offered by distance learning to students next semester, do you anticipate any **major changes** in the following?

Your course syllabus and student assignments:
A: #1: Not sure
#2: No
#3: Not sure

Amount of time you use personal computers:
A: #1: Yes
#2: Yes
#3: Yes

Your use of computers to communicate with students:
A: #1: Yes
#2: Yes
#3: Yes

Amount of time you spend with students in person outside of class:
A: #1: Not sure
#2: Yes
#3: Not sure

Number of students enrolled in the course:
A: #1: Not sure
#2: Not sure
#3: Not sure

Types of students enrolled in the course:
A: #1: Not sure
#2: Not sure
#3: Not sure

* Improve my writing skills.

* Improve my writing.

* I hope this will give me the impetus and direction as well as some techniques to allow me to become a better writer. I hope the input from Robert Dunn as well as the other students will clarify for me my talents as a writer.

* To learn more about computer data bases.

* To write better short stories.

* I'm an artist and physics is essential to understanding the world and to building things within it.

* I would like to learn about the UNIX operating system as it relates to my job. I would also like to get experience with distance learning to see if it really works.

* To improve my writing techniques, and hopefully learn how to market my work.

* I'm giving up my career as an attorney to pursue a doctorate in History. This requires meeting foreign language requirements. I'm getting a head start before matriculating this fall.

* To learn how to improve my writing skills.

* I need the credit to transfer to my school.

* I want to learn more about the information superhighway and explore its impact on our society. I also want to get back to the point where I am enjoying my classes again.

* Enhance my knowledge of implications of digital world; I teach college students about information sources, so I need to understand current technology better; I thought taking a course at home through the computer would be fun.

*Express my ideas clearly, study the history of ideas.

*Just curious about the subject science since I read SF but little gender.

*New teacher network/communication etc. for a group of new teachers. How are we? What happens? What do we think and do?

*The writing class to finish up my reams of things that are not finished. Emerson, Whitman, Thoreau, curiosity.

* Always wanted to understand more about the physical world.

* To have fun and learn something.

* To familiarize myself with the writings of these great thinkers.

FACULTY BEGINNING OF TERM QUESTIONNAIRES 1993-1994

Note: All three faculty taught a FIPSE course in the classroom in the fall, and the same courses on-line in the spring. These questionnaires were administered while they were teaching in the fall.

Q: Would you prefer to teach this course in a traditional classroom setting or through distance education, and why?

A: #1: No preference. One is familiar, the other an interesting experiment.

#2: Not sure. I so adore the classroom interaction that I'm hesitant to abandon it. On the other hand, I am perversely fascinated by the electronic highway and the consequences for teaching should we go this route. So, it's their eyes versus their words.

#3: Not sure. Since the course material is very new to me, I'm not sure how using a computer will affect the pedagogy. I do find myself thinking about how what I've done in the classroom the last three weeks would be different via computer-mediated communication.

Q: How long have you been using personal computers?

A: #1: 7 years
#2: 10 years
#3: 10 years

Q: Please rate your level of expertise in using personal computers: (Scale from 1 = "Low" to 5 = "High.")

A: #1: 2
#2: 2
#3: 5

Q: Please rate your level of comfort in using personal computers: (Scale from 1 = "Low" to 5 = "High.")

A: #1: 2
#2: 2
#3: 5

Q: Please elaborate on any of these anticipated major changes:

A: #1: For amount of time using computers - kind of self-evident for a course taught on-line!

For amount of time spent with students outside of class - office hours at the New School tend to be minimal, but I always try to be available for conferences. This, no doubt, will change in the spring.

#2: The course, in the spring, will be delivered on-line - not sure of its impact yet.

#3: For amount of time using computers - I'll clearly spend more time on the computer - time I would have spent in the classroom with verbal communication.

For using computers to communicate with students - Now I do not use computers for this function. Then I'll use it for 100% (or thereabouts) of my communication with them.

For amount of time spent with students outside of class - Now I spend about 30 minutes to 2 hours a week with students outside of class. Then I'll never be outside of class - it's all the same, in or out.

Q: Why were you interested in teaching this course in a traditional classroom setting?

A: #1: I wanted to bring together a group of writers, artists, musicians and film-makers who are not customarily corralled into the same sentence, all of them "modernists," if not always represented as such, and each of whom has been vital to my own life and work. The subjects of the course operate at various "crossroads": the 19th and 20th centuries; a full and a self-conscious art; pop and high culture, etc. They (taken together) would allow for an infinite variety, as they say, of exploring and analysis...I'm most grateful for the opportunity.

#2: I find it exciting to interface three seminal works about avante garde material, mostly from the field of cultural studies. In addition, the topic of identity is a "hot" one and allows me to "do" sociology in a relevant manner.

#3: I wasn't. I was drafted into the project without time to really consider whether I wanted to be involved. One day I was told that my involvement was desirable; then, before I had a chance to answer yes or no, a couple of days later I saw my name circulated in a public document attached to this course. I was surprised. I have become interested since because of a sense of professionalism.

Q: Why were you interested in teaching this course through distance learning technology?

A: #1: I want to see what will survive - first, of the so-called liberal arts curriculum, and second of a discussion-based, "Socratic method" class. It's a challenge - and a question I can't know the answer to until the spring.

#2: I'm fascinated with changes in the way we teach and how they affect what we teach.

#3: I wasn't. But I would add that the use of this technology intrigued me, and I saw participation in this phase of the project as interesting for my professional development.

PHONE INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY MEMBER #1
Spring 1994

Q: How did you feel about your experience this term?

A: While the course was going on, it felt like a roller-coaster, depending on student interaction. When it ended, I felt as though it largely worked, though there were some problems.

Q: What kind of problems?

A: Well, protocol, because of inexperience. Students weren't prepared to comment on-line when the papers were due - they disappeared for a while. The medium worked against the course - everything was writing, rather than coming to class. It started slowly - students didn't participate in DIAL training, which was a major problem. They spent two weeks figuring the technology out, and another two weeks off-line when writing their papers, so that's almost half the course.

Q: How often had you expected yourself, and the students to be on-line before the course started?

A: I had asked them to be on three to four times a week - in my first comments, and then I repeated the request. I did go on that much usually, although sometimes less to experiment and see what the students would do. It struck me that the way I'm doing it now, it's like a guided independent study, but I don't really know how to do that. I'm looking for guidance for that. I'm hoping they'll gain in independence.

For the most part, the depth of interaction I hoped for was not fulfilled. The fall course was very successful, and so I expected much from the students on-line also. This was a slow-moving class, with no intense follow-up as there had been in the class. The best students in the class weren't helped or hurt by the technology, but the students in the middle, the most important group, had trouble figuring out what to do.

Q: Could you have changed this somehow?

A: I'm not sure. I conceived it as a very ambitious course, but the material was not covered as thoroughly as in the fall- the term was shorter. I could reduce the material covered.

Q: What kind of adjustments did you find you had to make in the spring term class?

A: There wasn't enough time for the students to do everything. I would have framed the course differently if I had known - would have had fewer figures to cover. Near the end, it was clear to me that we couldn't go at this pace. I would like to have had more discussion, but there was not time. The course was very time-driven. Sometimes I gave up on something - like this video that was distributed. It was the most successful class in the fall, but no one even commented on it in the spring.

Ten figures in ten weeks, which I had planned, was too much. This raised the question of the level of the courses, and how ambitious they are. But still, it was exciting.

Q: If you had to choose one method of teaching this course, which would you choose? And which did you like better?

A: I can't really answer that, I enjoyed both very much. The fall was a more positive experience, but in the spring, I learned much, and it was a challenge. I think that all three of us professors remained ourselves on-line. The medium was not the message. We persisted in our own style now, but five years down the road, I don't know if we still would.

Q: Did you see or speak to any of the students in the spring term course outside of class?

A: I spoke to all of them at least once, and met one by accident. I initiated the contact for paper feedback. One student told me that I was the only teacher at the New School who had ever allowed contact outside regular office hours. I needed to talk to the students - on-line was not enough for feedback. Besides, my handwriting is terrible.

Q: What about the Tavern that you set up? How did that work? (NOTE: The Tavern was a second, more informal electronic mailbox set up specifically for students in thie class.)

A: There was social interaction in the fall, and some in the spring. I started it because I didn't want the course to be only self-reflective. The Tavern idea is being built into the new software. There was a need to interact in a more casual way, but I wanted to keep it separate from the regular class interaction. There were about 60 contributions.

Q: Did you notice any differences in the fall and spring term students?

A: There was a different sense of the level of their engagement, more in the fall than spring. We must address the tradeoffs of DIAL courses which allow students to come and go with the level of courses. It confounds the analysis of the experience when students take different courses, and some take more than one DIAL course.

Q: What would be your advice to someone teaching this course next year?

A: Make sure the students are steeped in the technology before they start class. Be flexible and change things in the course as you go along. At first I had divided students in groups of three and encouraged them to contact each other - this worked for some, but not others. Don't look at the on-line courses as translations of other courses - they must be retooled in terms of time and technology. It might be the compression of time that causes problems. There seems to be a momentum to these things, and mine was running out of gas at the end. Framed in a much more specific situation it would be better for all.

Q: Did you feel you changed in your level of expertise or comfort in using technology?

A: Maybe a slight increase in expertise, but not much change in attitude. It was a positive experience, but I'm still suspicious about what it means for the future of writing, of education, and the written word. There are lots of extreme positions out there, with the benefits extolled. The theory is in a weird place - anti-intellectual. But it won't change the world of education.

PHONE INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY MEMBER #2
Spring 1994

Q: How did you feel about your experience this term?

A: Perversely fascinating. Not an across the board feeling of great. Some pedagogical issues, required to really think. But something interesting about the students in the Spring. I've taught in other traditional settings - there's some different types of address. I will definitely be teaching another course on-line, and then will address the problems.

Q: What kind of problems?

A: Part of the success as teachers is convincing students to be passionate. This charismatic dimension is hard to replicate on-line. Much of it is generated by body language, but I'll try to figure out a way. Also, there's a different language on-line. I'm bawdy in class, but not funny on-line. More spontaneous in class, and lost that funny part on-line. I want to get humor in writing and on-line. It's now somewhat stilted. Also, I still don't get "up" versus "downloading." I couldn't do it at home. So I have unedited lectures on-line.

Q: How often had you expected yourself, and the students to be on-line before the course started?

A: I did not say "you are expected to log on-line X number of times." I treat them as adults. I expected 2 to 3 times per week of students. I did about once a day. The majority of students were well below expectations. Some students expressed more regret at the end, because of technical problems. About half of them had technical problems, and weren't on not because of lack of interest but the technical problems. When I do it again, I'll be firmer to tell them log on X times a week.

I expected to be on 2 hours twice a week. But actually it was often every day. For mostly not private comments to students but public for the whole class. In the summer I'll try to do it more at my desk, 2 to 3 times a week. I'll tell them they have to be on-line, and must write everything on-line.

Q: What kind of adjustments did you find you had to make in the spring term class?

A: The Fall semester I only got through 2 of the 3 books - lots of tangents. This wasn't necessarily pedagogically unsound, but did keep from the central purpose of lectures. In the on-line course there were no tangents because of the rigorous schedule. We finished the syllabus. I presented better on-line.

I wanted to do far too much in both terms (films, videos, a play). This is always the case, but nothing different beyond that.

Q: If you had to choose one method of teaching this course, which would you choose? And which did you like better?

A: The distance education. It fits nicely with my life. I shouldn't be teaching any more, but don't want to give it up. Distance learning has virtues for students as well as faculty.

Q: Did you see or speak to any of the students in the spring term course outside of class?

A: One came by to drop off a paper. It gave her an advantage - we were introduced. She has been by again, and I will invite her to dinner after grades are done.

I spoke to one on the phone. I did think it helpful to have contact. I like the gossip and inquisitiveness - know what they look like and are like. In the Fall, I established a connection with students. In the Spring on-line, I didn't know enough about them as people, and can't see ever writing to them again.

Q: Did you notice any differences in the fall and spring term students?

A: There's better discussions on-line than in class, not because of technology but I had a brighter class on-line. Three people in the performing arts (a famous violinist, an actor and an opera singer).

They read material more systematically in the Spring. In the Fall, they cam to watch my performance, not do work.

Q: What would be your advice to someone teaching this course next year?

A: Take an on-line course before teaching on-line. Still, doing it is the only way to learn. Be more firm and structures in telling the students what they must do.

Q: Did you feel you changed in your level of expertise or comfort in using technology?

A: My expertise and comfort are about equivalent. My family marvels about my doing it. I'm the brave test case - if I can teach on-line, anyone can. My expertise increases arithmetically, and my comfort level geometrically. Sometimes I'd send a lecture and it would come out fuzzy, and I don't know why. But I don't panic with the machine, although I haven't been able to maximize my learning about computers as much as regular faculty could.

Q: Other comments

A: I think my on-line lectures were more polished. It was not new material, and I was writing on a word processor. But it's a danger of becoming more polished.

Having taught on-line, I can now take my syllabus to a publisher and get it published, by finishing it on a computer. I can put the files together now - this is a benefit for me of the technology.

I would definitely spend more time in the future teaching on-line than in class. I'm anxious to see how it works out next year.

PHONE INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY MEMBER #4

Fall 1995

Q: How did you feel about your experience this term?

A: This was the most frustrating teaching experience of my life. I tried to cancel the class when it seemed clear that only 4 or 5 people had enrolled. I was told that the evaluation for FIPSE demanded that the class proceed. As it turned out, only two students fully participated. It proved impossible for me to maintain any kind of ongoing conversation. Then, it took one student two weeks to get through the on-line orientation. This seems a bit excessive.

My recommendation is that these courses need a critical mass of five students (minimum) in order for a truly dynamic, interactive classroom to be achieved.

Q: How often had you expected yourself, and the students to be on-line before the course started?

A: I expected to log on 3 or 4 times a week, and that was also my experience.

Q: What kind of adjustments did you find you had to make in the class?

A: Technical snafus demanded that I cut out many of the texts I had hoped to cover.

Q: If you had to choose one method of teaching this course, which would you choose? And which did you like better?

A: In the classroom. The human interaction seems to me an indispensable aspect of education - the pause, the raised voice, the questioning tone.

Q: Did you see or speak to any of the students in the spring term course outside of class?

A: Yes, because of the technical problems.

Q: Did you feel you changed in your level of expertise or comfort in using technology?

A: No - rate both at 3 (scale from 1 to 5).

PHONE INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY MEMBER #5
Spring 1995

1. Has taught in traditional classroom for about 5 years. Mostly traditional college age students, but about a quarter nontraditional adult students. This was first experience teaching on-line.

Definitely likes classroom better. On-line was a disaster. Despised lack of physical face-to-face connection with students. Feels this country is commercializing all experiences. In a classroom, some things would be effortless which can't be done on-line or only with mountains of work.

2. Will never teach this course, or any other, on-line again because of above reasons.

3 & 4. Rated own computer experience and comfort level at between 2 and 3. The class did not change these. Inevitable glitches, not anyone's fault interfered with course but only slightly. Endemic problems because K-12 system teaches students in a classroom, where they are socialized and know what to do. Don't know what to do on-line.

5. Made a rule in beginning of course that students have to sign on a minimum of 3 times a week. None of the students met it, but he didn't know how to enforce on-line discipline. There was also a drag in the beginning of class, when he wasn't sure who was actually in the class. Someone might show up on-line 3 weeks into the class who had been lurking there. If that happened in a classroom, he would have said it's too late to get in, but couldn't do that on-line. No punishments available.

Felt there was not enough interaction, which may have been his fault, because he didn't know how to stimulate interaction on-line. Simple to do in classroom.

6. Likes the responsibilities that come with traditional classroom -2 hours of teaching, going home and reading assignments. Didn't like the idea of being on 24-hour call with students - intrusive in his life.

He normally went on-line 3-4 times a day to check, even though student responses were sometimes not received for 5 to 6 days. Again, a socialization problem - there's no doing things for the group as there would be in a physical classroom.

Also, had a real feeling that anyone could read his on-line material, and a hard copy of it exists somewhere. Didn't like that - psychologically faculty may not like to share everything this way - a real threat to intellectual freedom.

7& 8. Saw one student outside of class on a regular basis. He called student because he seemed brilliant, and felt he wasn't getting enough out of the course. Thinks there should be mandatory beginning and end of term meetings. On-line conferencing could be very useful adjunct to classroom, and on-line courses also good for physically disabled or fearful people.

9. Didn't see any difference in the students: same lack of attitude to work, same New School types.

10. Had to make adjustments to course. Did only half of syllabus, because of 1) shorter time available, 2) technical problems (although relatively few), 3) problem getting students to respond to something, and 4) not wanting to berate people for not responding.

11. Advice: 1) Be careful what you say on line. 2) Realize you only have half the time that you think because of shorter time frame and response patterns. 3) Install class discipline immediately, and insist that students come on-line 4 times a week with penalties in the grade.

12. Other comment: DIAL office help-line understaffed - 2 people on 24-hour line. They get swamped in first few weeks from every student, and sometimes must take hours to get back to students.

PHONE INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY MEMBER #6
Spring 1995

Q: How did you feel about your experience this term?

A: Need a lot more time!

Q: How often had you expected yourself, and the students to be on-line before the course started?

A: The students seem to have trouble getting adjusted to the computer. I expected to log on three times a week, but actually did daily.

Q: What kind of adjustments did you find you had to make in the on-line class?

A: Students getting on-line problems made me slow down the syllabus.

Q: If you had to choose one method of teaching this course, which would you choose? And which did you like better?

A: I like the classroom better. Live interaction - spontaneous feedback, ability to immediately seem to make sense of a conversation. But I would prefer to teach this course again through distance education, to learn more about the process.

Q: Did you see or speak to any of the students in the spring term course outside of class?

A: Yes

Q: Did you notice any differences in the on-line students from stuednts in a classroom?

A: No

Q: What would be your advice to someone teaching this course next year?

A: Be prepared to spend a lot of time "in class". Make sure the students "attend" class - don't let them get too far behind. Be honest with yourself in terms of your own classroom structure.

Q: How would you rate your level of expertise or comfort in using technology?

A: Rate both at about 3 (on scale of 1 to 5)